The Froebel movement and state schooling 1880-1914 : A study in educational ideology

Thesis

KEVIN JOSEPH BREHONY B.A. (Open University)

THE FROEBEL MOVEMENT AND STATE SCHOOLING 1880-1914: A STUDY IN EDUCATIONAL IDEOLOGY.

Vol 1.

THESIS SUBMITTED IN FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF PH.D. THE OPEN UNIVERSITY

CENTRE FOR SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

SUBMITTED NOVEMBER 1987

Abstract

This thesis examines the relation between the Froebel movement and state schooling in England between 1880 and 1914. It is argued that the Froebelian pedagogy functioned as an ideology which expressed the interests of middle class women in the sphere of schooling and in particular, the interests of such women who were for political or religious reasons excluded from the dominant culture of the hegemonic fraction of the power bloc. It is further argued that the relation between the Froebel movement and state schooling during the period may best be approached through a consideration of the articulation of Froebelian ideology with ideologies of industrial modernization and national efficiency which were advanced by groups who aimed to modernize the schooling of young children who attended state schools. The failure of the Froebelians to transform state schooling in the way that they desired is shown to be not only an effect of their own lack of power and the inappropriateness of their strategies but also an effect of the relative failure of broader attempts to modernize state schooling.

The internal transformation of the Froebelian pedagogy is charted and it is related to external critiques, the main condition of existence of which was a search for a science of education which was linked to the perceived need for a new type of teacher. This transformation is also shown to have been determined by the requirements of the state system of schooling which broadly understood included not only schools but training colleges and state policies as w ll.

Acknowledgements.

The research for this thesis was carried out with the aid of a studentship from the SSRC now the ESRC. I am greatly indebted to Dr. I. R. Dale for his patience as well as for his intellectually stimulating comments during the period that the thesis was in preparation. I should also like to thank Rosemary Deem for her encouragement and support. For assistance with the development of my views on the state during this period I should like to thank the members of the CCCS State Group at Birmingham and my D209 students at Manchester. The responsibility for the errors and imperfections is, of course, my own.

CONTENTS

Vol 1.

CONTENTS

Vol 2

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Why a Study of the Froebel Movement?

This account of the Froebel movement and elementary schooling arose out of a wider project which set out to examine the relation between all forms of progressive or child-centred education and state schooling from the 1880's up until the outbreak of the Second World War. Progressive education, itself, was of interest for a number of reasons but, of these, the most important had to do with the desire to scrutinize progressive ideas and practices in order to assess the nature of their relation to socialist politics. The question which was to be investigated was that of the compatibility of progressive education with socialist principles. In pursuit of this aim it was intended to examine the ideas and practices of progressive education in order to identify what, if any, material interests were served by it and its relation to socialist political organizations. This project was abandoned for two main reasons. Firstly, on the grounds that it was over-ambitious with respect both to time and to the length of the finished account. Length, in this instance, was not an independent category but one which was dependent upon the criteria adopted with respect to what it means to recover the past. In other words, in order to recover the past of progressive education, in a way sufficient to produce an adequate account of the social interests linked to it, more space than is available would have been required.

A second reason for abandoning the original project concerns the category 'progressive education'. Transformed by some sociologists of education in the early 1970's into 'progressivism', an educational ideology, the label

contains the implication of an historical continuity the origin of which lay with the work of Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1770) and whose terminus was sometime in the mid 1970's. Not only did this approach ignore the differing historical contexts in which the phenomena of progressive education was said to have been present and the differing social forces promoting it but it also tended to obscure or gloss over the frequent transformations that the content of progressive education has undergone and the breaks in its historical development which have occurred as a consequence.

These transformations have tended to take place behind the backs of the terms which comprise the discourse of progressive education so that although terms like 'growth' and 'freedom' are present in differing historical contexts the meanings that they were made to bear differed considerably. A similar point may also be made about the practices of progressive education as the language of progressive education has been used to legitimize widely differing practices. For these reasons, therefore, the umbrella notion of progressive education was discarded in favour of something more specific. The Froebel movement met that criterion for, as will be argued, it alone through the period selected carried and transmitted ideas which are characteristic of child-centred education. As with the project as first envisaged, the Froebel movement lent itself to being treated as the bearer of an ideology which masked the material interests of its constituents and also was open to being utilized by other forces including some within the heart of the state apparatus which regulated schooling for their own interests and purposes.

The same approach could have been used in connection with other movements in education which have been considered progressive, and which perhaps are less obscure, such as that of Montessori, the New Ideals in Education group and the New Education Fellowship. (1) The Froebel movement, however, differs from these subsequent formations in one major respect and that is that it was the first of its kind to form in England. Moreover, it is regarded as significant that the period when it first began to coalesce was one which saw a massive extension of the state's involvement with schooling and an acceleration in the secularization of schooling across a broad spectrum which was marked by such trends as the laicisation of the staff at the public schools and of Her Majesty's Inspectorate. This convergence raises the possibility that the expansion of the state and the related manifestation of something akin to Weber's notion of rationalization were necessary conditions for the existence of the Froebel movement. (2) If that can be demonstrated, then rather than being the threat which right-wing commentators still assert them to be, Froebel's ideas and practices, and interpretations of them, may be seen to be much more in conformity with the requirements of schooling in an advanced capitalist society than is often supposed. (3)

1.2 Defining the Object.

This study is concerned, then, with the relation between the Froebel movement and the education of young children in England between 1880 and 1914. Taking what is indicated by the phrase 'the Froebel movement' first, a movement, in education, may be understood as being composed of people who come together for the attainment of a specific purpose which relates to education or schooling. In the case of the movement considered here ,

its purpose was the transformation of the education of young children in order that it might closely correspond to the ideas and practices, or more precisely to interpretations of those ideas and practices, which were advocated by the German educationalist , Friedrich Wilhelm August Froebel (1782-1852). For current purposes a principal defining characteristic of, a movement in education is the presence of a formal organisation at its core. (4) This serves to distinguish educational movements from formations of a more ephemeral kind such as were constituted in England by the followers of Jean Jacques Rousseau and Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1746-1827); who were both thinkers on education with whom Froebel is often seen as being closely associated. However, movements within education are rarely coterminous with their related formal organizations. Around those organizations such movements have, as Banks has suggested in relation to the 'student movement', ' a less well articulated penumbra of *adherents*'.(5) Thus the movement considered here, is taken to consist not only of the members of the Froebel Society, which constituted the movement's organizational core, but also those who declared or otherwise showed themselves to be sympathetic towards Froebelian ideas and practices.

1.2 The Education and Schooling of Young Children.

With regard to the phrase, 'the education of young children', the term education was deliberately chosen in preference to schooling because it denotes a broader area of inquiry. Although much of what is to be examined is better described as schooling the scope of the phenomena to be investigated goes beyond schooling. While there has been, in recent years, a tendency to distinguish schooling from education (6) the

distinction was frequently made in the late Victorian and the Edwardian periods by educationalists and others.(7) Both then, and as now, schooling has been used to denote the institutionalization of the processes of teaching and learning. Education, on the otherhand, encompasses schooling but signifies a much wider field. It refers, in addition, to the operation of the processes of teaching and learning in informal settings and in social relations such as those between the dominant and the subordinated classes; relations which are not generally thought of as educational. The scope of education understood in this way is so broad and its range so pervasive that its history may become that of an entire social formation. (8) But in order to keep this investigation within manageable boundaries, the education of young children, as used here will denote only teaching and learning in a few selected settings other than schools.

As used here, schooling will be taken to include pedagogy, which refers to the methods, principles and the organization of teaching and also curricula, which denotes, at a general level, the subject matter or knowledge which schools attempt to transmit. In addition, schooling will also be taken to refer to theories, however rudimentary, which have to do with teaching and learning in schools as well as to policies and actions of the local and central apparatuses which control the administration of schools.

The inclusion of educational policy in the definition of schooling permits attention to be directed to the state and to the schools which were directly regulated by it. But while this account is concerned primarily with state schooling, the relation between the public sphere of schooling

and the private sphere in which the Froebelian institutions were situated forms an important theme throughout the study.

In this context, the rather vague phrase,' young children' is used as a synonym for the age range catered for by today's, Primary stage of schooling but the main focus will be upon the schooling of children between the ages of three and seven years of age. However, it is not intended that this study shall be solely a history of the institutions provided for the schooling of children of this age group. Among other things, to focus only on institutions such as infant and nursery schools would be to restrict, in advance, the range of possible effects of the Froebel movement upon the schooling of young children. It would preclude, for example, a consideration of the places in which theories concerning the schooling of young children were produced. It would also exclude the possibility that the different levels of schooling are mutually determining. Thus, the area of infant and nursery schooling, which has been rather neglected by historians of education, (9) will be examined alongside some of the provisions which were made for older children and, where relevant, the arrangements for training the teachers of the young.

1.3 Geographical Scope.

That this study is restricted almost entirely to England has already been indicated. Different cultural traditions and different educational practices do not permit the construction of a single, undifferentiated history of British education. However the fact that the Froebel movement was international in its scope and sufficienly self-conscious of its internationalism to form, in 1893, a body entitled the International Kindergarten Union makes reference to other countries essential. (10) The

International Kindergarten Union, for example, was based in the United States, where the incorporation of Froebelian practices into the school system was much more widespread than elsewhere. For this reason and because of the prestige of the United States during the period, a full account of the Froebel movement in England is not possible without some reference to developments in education there. The same is true of Germany but not because the Froebel movement there was particularly vigorous but because many English educationalists were attracted by German attempts to produce a 'science' of education; an endeavour which had important consequences for the reception of the Froebel movement's message. Developments in neighbouring Scotland will also be referred to but only in as much as they shed light on events and developments in England.

1.4 Periodization.

A common approach in studies of this kind is to engage in a search for origins in the belief that if the origin of a particular phenomenon can be identified then something important about its subsequent development may be discerned. Common sense might dictate that in this particular case the starting point of an account of the Froebel movement in England should be the moment at which it first manifested itself. However, instead of adopting a periodization derived from the internal development of the Froebel movement, this study takes the year 1880 as its starting point on the grounds that it is primarily the relation between the Froebel movement and aspects of state schooling, rather than the Froebel movement alone, which is to be considered. In 1880, with the introduction of compulsory attendance at school a significant point was reached in the development of state schooling. It was the moment at which a universal or

national system of elementary schooling became inscribed in law. With respect to the education of children, the *laissez faire* or night-watchman state barely, if ever, existed. State intervention in this field had begun with the Factory Acts and, in the 1830's, Parliamentary grants were soon followed by a system of administration to distribute them and a system of inspection to secure value for money. However, the introduction of compulsory attendance marked a major shift in the extent to which the state regulated schooling and the condition of childhood. Compulsory attendance at school also marked a fundamental shift in the relation between the public and the private spheres as fathers no longer had the right to dispose of their children's labour during the years when their attendance at school was compulsory. For that reason compulsory attendance marked a qualitatively different moment to previous interventions by the state and owing to that, it may be seen as a moment in the formation of a new type of state. This new form was given the name of the 'democratic collectivist state' by Michael Sadler, a leading educationalist of the time. (11)

The choice of 1914 as the point at which to terminate the study was determined by considerations of a different nature. The 'grand fact' of the outbreak of world war is inescapable. It led to the suspension of 'normality' in the practices of schooling as in other areas of social practice. In some cases what had constituted normality in the area of schooling was only suspended temporarily but in others, such as those areas of educational practice which were effected by the Education Act of 1918, the suspension was permanent. (12) The broad outlines of such things as elementary school curriculum and pedagogy were, however, much

too deeply embedded to be permanently disrupted even by the cataclysmic events which followed the onset of war in 1914.

A more pertinent reason for the choice of 1914 as the point at which to end this account is that in that year, a conference on the Montessori system of education was held at East Runton in Norfolk.(13) After this conference, the Montessori Society, which had organised it, split (14) and there emerged a committee which organised a grouping entitled 'New Ideals in Education'. The significance of these developments was that, while the arrival in England of the ideas and practices of the Italian educationalist Maria Montessori (1870-1952) some years previously (15) had presented a challenge to the Froebelians' hegemony in the field of alternatives to existing education, the first conference of the New Ideals group may be taken to mark the ending of that hegemony. That the Froebel movement was hegemonic among the movements constituting what was termed the 'New Education' remains to be demonstrated as does the contention that the Montessori inspired movements destroyed that hegemony. It might be the case, for example, that the decline of the Froebel movement was due to other factors and that the emergence of the Montessori and other movements was coincidental. One thing that may be asserted however, is that something of significance with respect to ideas about the schooling of young children occurred during the years immediately preceding 1914. Partly in recognition of this new direction, Selleck selected 1911 as the date for the beginning of progressivism in England.(16) Similarly and allowing for crucial differences between that nation and England, several historians in the United States also detect in this period a recomposition of the various strands seeking the reform of education. They are also

agreed that in this process the Froebelians were supplanted by those whom they call the progressives.(17)

2.0 Assumptions Underlying the Choice of Object.

All history is written from a particular point of view which determines the choice of object, the selection of evidence and the way that the finished account is presented. This fundamental point is one which many historians would reject. For them, the practice of history consists primarily in the recovery or the disinterment of the past and the guarantee of its objectivity is provided by the evidence which has been produced. (18) Evidence, which has been proved to be reliable, is used by such historians to make a case or refute existing ones and as a means of making historical problems intelligible. Theories, sociological or otherwise, are eschewed by such historians on the grounds that there is a danger that evidence may be pressed into the service of the theory and that awkward facts may be elided.

That historical writing requires evidence is beyond debate but any attempt to produce historical work which takes seriously the need both to deploy evidence and, crucially, to account theoretically for it is a perilous enterprise for the twin dangers of empiricism and theoreticism are ever present. In the case of the Froebel movement, the lure of empiricism is strong because while there are numerous accounts of Froebel's ideas and practices there are very few accounts of how those ideas and practices did or did not enter schools or of the Froebel movement itself. Thus there were insufficient, extant, empirical materials upon which theories could be brought to bear. Before that could occur those materials had first to be assembled. However, if, as has been

suggested, all historians produce history which contains assumptions of an ideological or theoretical nature then it is incumbent upon them to reveal what those assumptions are. The existing accounts of Froebel's work and the Froebel movement are notable for the absence of any explicit theoretical assumptions and yet the assumptions of their authors are not hard to discern.

In most previous accounts of the Froebel movement the explanatory concept most in evidence is that of influence. Typically, along with a history of the origins and development of Froebel's ideas and practices, attempts have been made to demonstrate Froebel's influence upon the education of young children.(19) However the use of a notion of influence in these accounts is highly problematic. Influence is generally but imputed not demonstrated as this, in most instances, is not possible. This procedure is all too common in histories of educational ideas which purport to show how changes and developments in school curricula, for example, are solely traceable to the influence of a particular educationalist.(20) These 'Great Men' explanations, are distinguished, then, by the mainly unsupported claims that they make about the influence of their particular ' Great Man' upon educational change. No matter how ambiguous the evidence the hand of the 'Great Man' is claimed to have been at work and little room is allowed for other possible determinations. (21) Caught in the trap of methodological individualism such accounts typically lack a sociological dimension. They ignore the operation of relations of power so that the question of why specific elements of the programmes of some educational movements are incorporated into systems of schooling but not others is rarely addressed and if it is, explanations tend to concentrate on the

logic of the movement's proposals or the lucidity of its argument. On the other hand, if it is assumed that educational movements are successful in proportion to the extent that they are able to mobilize forces which have the power to implement their programmes then the question of power relations in educational systems is a crucial one.

A further objection which can be made to attempts to the use of the notion of influence is that it is generally seen as operating in only one direction. Thus the Froebel movement is held to have influenced class room practices but in acting to change the world, movements are themselves changed. A more adequate approach, then, is one that looks at the reciprocal action of an educational movement with the object it seeks to change - the extant forms and systems of education - and which also considers the structural determinants and conditions which shape both. A focus on reciprocity and interaction also opens up the possibility of a much more critical approach to the Froebel movement itself than is present in most of the existing work. This literature tends to be of the kind in which an assumed, unreservedly 'good' movement struggled to influence an unreservedly ' bad' system of education. (22) While it is possible to defend the latter view the former has attained the status of a myth which is in urgent need of revision.

In contrast also to existing accounts this one is based on the assumption that schooling itself is not a neutral practice insulated from social and political struggles but, contrary to prevailing constructions of it, schooling is a mu h contested practice. At stake in the historically recurring contestations, over and within, schooling are its aims and the means for their attainment, although the two are not necessarily always

explicitly linked. Debates over the aims of schooling generally refer to an often unstated concern with the shape of existing but, more importantly, the lineaments of future society. The form that future social relations should take is a question that nearly always accompanies debates within and about schooling because of the existence of a widespread, liberal, belief in its potential to determine those relations. It is also commonly and uncritically assumed that debates over methods of teaching and the content of curricula are important because their outcomes can critically effect the future of individuals and through them, the future of society. Although there are good grounds for being sceptical about such assumptions and the way in which they abstract the relations of schooling from other educative relations and grant them primacy in the determination of the future of individuals or societies, they nevertheless exist and exert a powerful influence on the politics of schooling. As well as any conception of schooling as an object of struggle, a concept of the state is also noticeably absent from the literature on the Froebel movement and this despite the fact that it spent a great deal of its time trying to get the apparatus of the state responsible for the content of schooling to adopt a Froebelian pedagogy. In this account, the formation of a new kind of state will be identified as being of considerable importance to an understanding of the history of the education of young children in the period which is addressed here. It will be proposed that schooling, which quantitatively if not qualititatively was one of the state's most important fields of intervention, changed as the state itself was transformed but that those changes were constrained,

as were those within the state itself, by the balance of forces within the state and within civil society.

2.2 Educational Ideologies.

As was indicated above, a central concept adopted here for the analysis of the Froebel movement and its relationship with state schooling is that of ideology and specifically, educational ideology. The first sociological use of the concept 'educational ideology' which has been discovered, was made by the educationalist Sir Fred Clarke (1880-1952). Clarke's work was characterised by a concern with what may be termed the politics of education; the terrain on which educational ideologies most frequently appear. During the 1930's in a number of articles and addresses he, unusually for an educationalist of the period, utilised the term ideology which, for him, meant something like a façade behind which was to be found, 'a very real material interest'.(23) In 1940, Clarke wrote Education and Social Change for 'The Moot', a private discussion group with a Christian complexion. In it he noted the need for a series of monographs on the educational ideologies of different groups citing Methodists, Chartists and Country Gentry as examples. (24) However deception either of self or by others was never far distant from Clarke's understanding of educational ideologies. They were to be found, he thought, when authors introduced 'politico-social' ideals at points when they thought themselves to be discussing 'pure educational theory'. Thus, in this text, ideology was defined as:

> ...the undetected influence upon what is supposed to be generalized thought of the interests and attitudes of

> national, class and other groups by which the writer or thinker has been formed.(25)

The influence of the sociologist, Karl Mannheim, on these formulations was acknowledged by Clarke who described himself as acting as Mannheim's 'mouthpiece'.(26) He was not however, unaware of the dangers of relativism towards which Mannheim's theories led but he took from Mannheim the notion that educational thought was conditioned by sociological and historical factors.

Clarke's suggested projects on educational ideologies were not immediately taken up as functionalism in its various forms came to dominate the emerging study of the sociology of education. (27) Within the functionalist sociologies of education there was little room for a theory of ideology. Ironically, Clarke was referenced in, what was the first work to attempt the adumbration of educational ideologies in the way which he had proposed but the reference was not to Clarke's concept of educational ideology and neither was the term used. The work in question was Raymond Williams' chapter, 'Education and British Society' which appeared in his book, The Long Revolution. In what was to become a much reproduced discussion, Williams identified what he described as three 'fundamental arguments' about the purposes of education in the Nineteenth century and related them to three distinctive groups. (28) Ten years after Williams' book first appeared, M.F.D.Young, in a reader which became the founding text of the short-lived 'new sociology of education', transformed Williams' 'arguments' into what he described as, 'distinct sets of educational philosophies or ideologies'. (29) In a footnote to his article, Young provided a number of clues as to what he meant by the concept of educational ideology which, he

argued, had been used in the literature in an 'unsatisfactory' way. For him, educational ideologies were ideas and beliefs which influenced practice and which could be related to particular social contexts. Young called, therefore, for:

> A detailed historical study of the social composition of the groups involved and the social and political circumstances in which their ideas developed and influenced 'educational practice would make an important contribution to our understanding of the origins, persistence and change of educational ideologies.(30)

As will be seen, this study conforms closely to this proposal of Young in that it seeks to reveal the connections between Froebelian ideas and practices and the social and political location of their bearers.

After Knowledge and Control the discussion of educational ideology gained momentum partly as a consequence of a revived interest in Marxism which stimulated a mushrooming of works on ideology, too extensive to be reviewed here, and partly as a consequence of sociological work of a radical nature on education. Among the latter, the courses on education presented by the Open University were important. In one of the first of these, Cosin argued that an ideology was a system of ideas which advanced or defended the interests of a given collectivity. (31) He then proceeded to describe four 'ideologies of education' which, he claimed somewhat speculatively, constituted, 'the bulk of thinking about education in this country' but in none of the cases discussed did he attempt to demonstrate the social bases of these ideologies.(32)

In another Open University course published in 1976, Malcolm Skilbeck provided a more extended discussion of educational ideology. He defined the concept as denoting:

> the system of beliefs and values (about the purpose of education) held by a particular group of educators. (33)

Further on, Skilbeck sought to explicate the relation between educational ideologies and the interests of, what he called,'social-class groups'. Educational ideologies satisfied those interests, he argued, but were not exclusively inspired by the groups themselves nor did they necessarily 'mirror political, economic and various other forms of social activity'. (34) Throughout his discussion, Skilbeck sought to establish what might be termed the relative autonomy of educational ideology from other ideologies. Educational ideologies, he stressed, had been for centuries generated by the 'pedagogical community' and that community did not necessarily have recourse to prevailing political, economic or social ideologies. (35) The language was cautious; there was a link, argued Skilbeck, between educational ideologies and structure but educational ideologies could not simply be reduced to an economic base or even to a political and social superstructure. In other respects Skilbeck's language was ambiguous; educational theory was conflated with educational ideology apparently because he did not want to accept a positivist view of science. Research on education, on the other hand was treated with fewer concessions to relativism but the findings of research, in his view, were open to ideological uses. Finally, like Cosin, Skilbeck identified and described a number of educational ideologies and in justifying this procedure he

introduced an element of practice into his conception of educational ideologies. They were, he wrote:

> a convenient way of referring to ideas and practices which are sufficiently related to enable us to discern a general outlook or a consistent course of action.(36)

From about the time of the appearance of Skilbeck's work on educational ideologies the phrase became domesticated and entered the vocabulary of many sociologists of education. No causal link between Skilbeck's work and the upsurge in the usage of educational ideology is here implied or intended. A feature common to most of these usages is that there are no restrictions on the number of ideologies which can be identified, no criteria are provided for distinguishing ideological beliefs from non-ideological ones and few attempts are made to identify the social interests served by the ideologies discovered.(37) In this respect, what were identified as educational ideologies were, in former times, described as philosophies.

A notable exception to this kind of usage occurred in the essay 'social democracy, education and the crisis' by Finn, Grant and Johnson.(38) These authors proposed a means of distinguishing two aspects of the relation between schooling and ideology. Firstly, they spoke of the 'ideological work' of schools themselves - broadly what schools do- and secondly they referred to ideologies about schools which express, 'particular versions of what schools are for, of how they work and of what it is possible for them to achieve'. (39) This latter area is one that is intimately bound up with the politics of education and is concerned with policy and relations of power over and within the system of education. *In*

addition, Finn, Grant and Johnson claimed that ideologies were distinguished from other ideas about education by the fact that they misrecognised, masked or incompletely grasped the primary workings of the institutions they had most closely in focus.(40) Despite a clear statement of the intention to only to discuss ideologies about education, Finn, Grant and Johnson registered, almost in passing, the existence of an ideology internal to what they termed the 'primary processes' of schools. Thus progressivism was described by them as, 'an educational and ideological approach to the technical and pedagogical problems of teaching' and its social base was identified as being made up of teachers seeking more autonomy. (41) In a subsequent work, produced by roughly the same group, this type of educational ideology is not referred to but, following Larrain's reading of ideology in Marx, the authors argue that ideas are said to be ideological when they conceal or resolve in an idealistic or imaginary way the problematic character of social life. Furthermore, ideological accounts were held to function so as to secure the position of dominant social groups.(42)

In this work of Finn, Grant and Johnson, as well as in that of Skilbeck, there is visible a distinction between ideologies about what schools do for themselves and ideologies about what they are able to do for the social formation within which they are located. For Bourdieu and Passeron, what schools do is, in part, an effect of the transhistorical demands which constitute what they call their 'essential function of inculcation'. (43) This they distinguish from their external functions of legitimation and social and cultural reproduction which, they argue, are best secured when the relative autonomy of the school conceals its

contribution towards the attainment of these external functions. The analysis of Bourdieu and Passeron, perhaps because of its functionalist anchorage, tends to regard only the external functions performed by schooling as the terrain of ideology. What schools do is treated rather as a technical question but, if anything, the relation is stronger between political ideologies and the methods of schooling than between such ideologies and their supposed external functions.

More recent work on ideology has been concerned not with questions about what it is and descriptions of specific ideologies but with seeking to explicate its role in the formation of subjectivities. Little of this work has yet been applied to the process of schooling. However one exception which broaches the question of the nature of educational ideologies, is a recent contribution by James Donald. In it, he argues that educational ideologies can be defined as:

> clusters of concepts, beliefs and values, organized in certain linguistic codes, and circulating historically within particular discursive fields...(44)

These he distinguishes from what he terms sciences and techniques which, he claims, are:

> integral to the routines of schooling in ways that cannot altogether be explained in terms of ideology.(45)

That is so, he argues, because the sciences and techniques are not representations of schooling, as occur in educational ideologies but forms of knowledge which provide the motor of schooling. In adopting this position, Donald touches upon the problem of the tendency for ideology to become all-inclusive and the need to define some areas of culture as being

outside ideology. His choice of science and techniques to constitute this space is, however, problematic. As Skilbeck argued, science, whatever its epistemological status, is open to being used for the pursuit of social interests and it may function as ideology. Moreover, it is conceivable, if science could be adequately distinguished from ideology, that the routines of schooling are not scientific but principally ideological in character. Before turning to a consideration of what may be recovered from these diverse approaches to educational ideology it is desirable to look for a moment at the way in which historians of education and others have handled the question of ideology in education. Until recently, historians tended to deal not with the concept of ideology but with ideas. However, as Stuart Hall has argued, 'whatever else it signals, the concept *ideology* makes a direct reference to the role of *ideas*.'(46) In their treatment of ideas in education, historians have almost always slipped into the Great Man accounts which were criticised previously. If this is the negative side of such work, their positive achievement was to demonstrate that ideas in education exhibit various patterns and these can be described and classified. Leaving aside the problem that different principles of classification, particularly those utilised by philosophers, produced different taxonomies; associated with the work of classification was the recognition that ideas and their holders frequently came into conflict. Both of these elements are present in the work of the Rev. R.H. Quick (1831-1891) the founder of the history of education in England. (47) For Quick, three of his eponymous educational reformers founded what he called the 'New Education' which, he argued, was directly opposed to the old or the dominant form of education.(48) In many respects R.J.W.Selleck, whose

work constitutes the 'received wisdom' concerning the historical development of progressive education, is very much in the same tradition as Quick despite his concern with the context in which ideas on education arose.(49) What this tradition lacks, compared for example to the work of Michael Sadler and Fred Clarke, (50) is a sense of the political dimension involved in the conflict of ideas and a recognition that these ideas are entangled with 'interests'. It is perhaps a measure of the increasing division of labour within the study of education and the non-cumulative nature of theorising about education, that this tradition was largely ignored in Young's call for a politics of educational knowledge.

2.3 Educational Ideology Summarized.

It should be clear by now, even from a survey as cursory as this one, that ideology is used by historians and sociologists of education in at least two different ways. One usage refers to ideas about the purposes of education and its distribution and the other refers to ideas within education concerning pedagogy and curricula. Few, however, have examined the possible articulation of these two levels although Skilbeck's work suggests ways in which this might be approached. Furthermore, common sense understandings of the area also suggest that the levels are linked. For example, those non-authoritarian pedagogical ideas and practices which are commonly labelled 'progressive', are generally seen as tending to draw support from those who politically are Left of centre and who favour the expansion of educational opportunities and education for self-development.(51)

Furthermore, most accounts of ideology in education raise the issue of 'interests'. In some approaches to the study of ideology those interests

are seen solely as class interests and, through various mechanisms, ideas are seen as attached to social classes. With respect to ideas about pedagogy, it is extremely difficult to attribute to them any essential class belonging or identity although they may be seen to be aligned with particular political positions. This, on the other hand, does not rule out the possibility that such ideas may be made to serve particular class and non-class interests. If it is accepted that ideas about pedagogy may be articulated to political ideologies and that any claims that may be made about their scientificity must take into account the possibility that the very problems that they address are determined by pre-existing ideas about what is desirable, then there are no compelling grounds to accept Donald's distinction between educational ideologies and 'scientific' theories of, for example, child development. If relativism is the risk run by arguing that science is not free from the ingress of interests, the argument that science exists outside of, or untouched by, ideology is in danger of being at best mere assertion. In this sense, the conflation of *educational ideologies and educational theories by Selleck is defensible* because it is arguable that no adequate means of distinguishing the two is available as well as the fact of the poverty of most theory of education. Nevertheless, as has been noted, one major problem with regarding educational ideologies and educational theories as similar - if not identical- is that the domain of ideology becomes all embracing. Thus in order to evade this problem, Finn, Grant and Johnson categorized as ideological, only those ideas which masked and concealed the 'primary' workings of the institutions which they focussed upon. This attempt to narrow the range of ideology runs into the familiar objection that in

order to identify those ideas which mask and conceal and the action of the process of concealment, some means must exist of guaranteeing that the 'primary' workings of institutions may be known. A pragmatic response to this epistemological problem could take the form that, as no such guarantee is possible and that only practice can reveal that which approximates most closely to the real, then the objection is not crucial. Larrain, however, has argued that for ideas to be ideological they must not only conceal contradictions but they must do so to the benefit of the dominant class.(52) Without a means of identifying what benefits the dominant class which can be 'read-off' a grand theory this formulation is unable to differentiate between what is and what is not ideological. It also risks the view that as the dominant class is still the one that dominates, then the social formation is functional for its rule. Nevertheless it should still be possible, in this instance, to describe those pedagogies which suppress or ignore the real relations of schooling which have to do with such things as the unequal access to power of teachers and taught, as ideological. However, this does not move the discussion of ideology on much beyond the notion that it is a socially determined error. In order to do that the social forces sustaining and reproducing that error need to be elucidated.

Rather than abandon ideology altogether, on the grounds that its use runs into a number of insoluble problems, some of the senses in which it has been used, particularly those which focus on the representation of social and political interests, will be drawn upon throughout this study in order to explain a number of features having to do with the relation between the Froebel movement and state schooling. That this procedure

cannot avoid a certain degree of eclecticism is unavoidable given the fragmented nature of the concept of ideology both as used in a general sense and in the particular sense of ideologies of education. However, the concept of educational ideologies is one that raises questions about the relationship between the ideas and practices which inform or legitimate the school practices on the one hand and social structure on the other and the utility of the concept may only be measured by the extent to which it illuminates a particular sociological or historical area.

3.0 The Structure Of the Study.

This account begins with a discussion of the nature of the relation between ideas and practices in the course of a survey of Froebel's key ideas and practices. The main purpose of this chapter is not to present a critique of Froebel's work nor to show the social conditions in which it was produced but to introduce the Froebelian conceptual vocabulary and to highlight those aspects of the form and the content of Froebel's work which may be seen to have made it eminently suitable as a means for the pursuit of interests in the field of education.

Froebel's ideas and practices were formed in civil society but during the period addressed in this study some of them were utilised by the state and by social groups putting forward programmes for the modernization of schooling. Among Marxist theorists, few have taken seriously the nature of civil society as much as Gramsci and in chapter 2, Gramsci's theory of the intellectuals will be used to build a general account of the politics of schooling and school knowledge during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. In the following chapter the whole period will also be surveyed in order to provide a sociological analysis of the Froebel

movement. There, it will be argued that the Froebelian ideology is best understood as masking the interests of certain categories of middle class women and representing the position of middle and upper class groups which were excluded from the culture of the hegemonic bloc.

In the chapters which follow attention will be paid to providing evidence for the claims made in chapters 2 and 3. Specifically, chapter 4 will examine the material and ideological barriers to the implementation of the Froebelian pedagogy during the 1880's. In chapter 5 the state of the Froebel movement, the factions which composed it and its strategies to gain state support for its programmes during the 1880's will be discussed. This will be followed by an account of how Froebelian ideas and practices were taken up during the late 1880's by forces seeking to modernize the schooling of the working class by making it more responsive to the requirements of production. In line with the aim of emphasising the interaction of the Froebel movement with other forces, the bid to attach its fortunes to those of the industrial modernizers will be discussed. The chapter will also consider the reaction of the state apparatus or the Education Department to the modernizers campaign and it will also assess the extent to which this first serious attempt to make the schooling of the working class subordinate to the requirements of industry was successful. In chapter 7 attention will shift to the training of teachers. The Froebelian stress on training and professionalism will be outlined along with an account of the training given to the mass of elementary school teachers. It will be argued that when, in the 1890's, demands were made for better training and for middle class teachers to enter the schools of the working class the Froebelians were well placed to occupy

the institutional spaces which had recently been provided for these teachers of a new type. These new colleges lacked a theory of pedagogy and in chapter 8 an account will be given of what the search for that theory produced. In particular, the chapter will focus on the appropriation of the work of Herbart and of Dewey by the colleges and the effects that this pursuit of theory had on the Froebel movement. Chapter 9 continues the theme of the previous chapter by examining the attempts in the 1890's to found a science of education built on the observation of children. In particular, it will contain an examination of the work of Stanley Hall and the followers of Galton in setting new measures of adequacy for educational theories. It will also seek to show that as educational theory was rationalized the conditions were produced for the rise of a new faction within the Froebel movement and for the transformation of the Froebelian pedagogy.

The next chapter will seek to show the connections between this revised pedagogy and a conception of Froebelian child saving practice which arose out of the convergence between middle class feminism and the settlement movement. From this juncture emerged a number of initiatives aimed at the attachment of the urban poor to society and these, together with the response to them of the state, will be discussed. The state's response will also form the central concern of the final chapter which will seek to show how the collectivist thrust of the initiatives described in chapter 10 was contained by forces within the state arguing for financial rectitude and by others seeking to maintain an active private sphere. The point at issue here was that of the schooling of the under fives which brought the Froebel movement and its allies into the political arena to

fight for the provision of nursery schools and against state policy which had the effect of placing the responsibility for the care of young children on the home. The chapter will conclude by arguing that the upsurge of interest in the method of Montessori ended the period in which the Froebel movement was unchallenged as the source of virtually all alternative pedagogy and theories of pedagogy concerned with the schooling of the young child. Some reasons why the work of Montessori proved so alluring within the pedagogic community will also be advanced.

FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES.

1). For these movements see: Selleck, R. J. W. (1972) English Primary Education and the Progressives 1914-39. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

2). The literature on Weber's concept of rationalization is very extensive but for the most frequently cited source see: Weber, M. (1967a) 'The Social Psychology of the World Religions' in Gerth, H. H. and Wright Mills, C. (eds.) From Max Weber. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. pp. 267-301. For a useful commentary see: Roth, G. and Schluchter, W. (1979) Max Weber's Vision of History. Berkley, University of California Press.

3). For a recent right-wing assault on the ideas of Froebel see: Partington, G. (1987) 'The Disorientation of Western Education', Encounter, Vol. LXVIII, No. 1. pp. 5-15.

4). Banks, J. A. (1971) Sociology as a Vocation. Leicester. Leicester University Press p. 8

5). ibid.

6). See: Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies , University of Birmingham, Education Group. (1981) Unpopular Education. London. Hutchinson. pp. 14-15. and Johnson, R. (1981) 'Education and Popular Politics'. Unit 1. E353 Society, Education and the State. Milton Keynes, Open University Press. pp. 12-13.

7). This was particularly common among those who were attracted by Idealist philosophy and who sought the creation of an 'ethical' state. See: Gordon, P. and White, J. (1979) Philosophers as Educational Reformers. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. pp. 63-64. The distinction was especially prominent in the work of the educationalist, Michael Sadler (1861-1943) who, although linked to the Idealist philosophers, advocated an educative community rather than an educative state. A typical statement of this position is: Sadler, M. (1979a) 'In What Sense Ought Schools to Prepare Boys and Girls for Life'. in Higginson, J. H. (ed.) Selections From Michael Sadler. Liverpool, Dejall and Meyorre. pp. 35-40. For a different use of the distinction see: Findlay, J. J. (1911a) The School. London, Williams and Norgate. pp. 20-21.

8). This point is discussed in: Simon, J. 'The History of Education in Past and Present'. Oxford Review of Education. Vol. 3. No. 1. 1977. pp. 71-72. and in Eisele, C. J. 'Defining Education: a Problem for Educational History'. Educational Theory. Vol. 30, No.1, 1980. pp. 25-33. and Feinberg, W. (1983) Understanding Education. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. pp. 145-146.

9). Exceptions to this lack of attention include: Whitbread, N. (1972) The Evolution of the Nursery-Infant School. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. and Deasy, D. (1978) Education Under Six. London, Croom Helm. The following work illuminates well the political context surrounding the first infant schools in Britain: McCann, P. and Young, F. A. (1982) Samuel Wilderspin. London, Croom Helm.

10). On the movement's internationalism see: Woodham-Smith, P. (1952) 'History of the Froebel Movement in England' in Lawrence, E. (ed.) Friedrich Froebel and English Education. London, University of London Press. p. 60. For the dispersal of the kindergarten and its global distribution in the early years of this century see: Vandenwalker, N. C. (1912) 'The Kindergarten'. in Monroe, P. (ed.) A Cyclopedia of Education. Vol. 3. New York, Macmillan. pp. 598-606. Note, full names are given for abbreviations wherever possible.

11). See: Sadler, M. (1911a) 'The State and English Education'. Sociological Review. Vol. 1V. No 2. p. 97. For Sadler see: Sadleir, M. (1949) Michael Ernest Sadler. London, Constable. Grier, L. (1952) Achievement in Education. London, Constable. and Cohen, S. 'Sir Michael E. Sadler and the Sociopolitical Analysis of Education'. History of Education Quarterly. Vol. 7, Fall, 1967. pp. 281-294. On the transition see: Hall, S. (1984) 'The Representative-Interventionist State 1880's-1920's'. Unit 7. D209. The State and Society. Milton Keynes, The Open University Press. and Langan, M. and Schwartz, B. (1985) (eds.) Crises in the British State 1880-1930. London, Hutchinson.

12). For the impact of the First World War on education in England see: Sherington, G. (1981) English Education, Social Change and War 1911-20. Manchester, Manchester University Press.

13). The conference was announced in the Times Educational Supplement June 2nd, 1914. For a report of the conference: Times Educational

Supplement August 4th, 1914. See also Holmes, E. G. A. (1931) 'New Ideals in Education'. New Ideals Quarterly. Vol. 5, No. 1. pp. 5-6.

14). Details of the differences between those like Lord Lytton (1876-1947) - who wished to widen the appeal of the Montessori Society to embrace 'Montessori and other kindred movements' - and the founders of the new Montessori Society appear in the Times Educational Supplement January 5th, 1915. A report of the new Montessori Society's activities occurs in the Times Educational Supplement March 2nd, 1915. The reasons for the split are discussed in: Kramer, R. (1968) Maria Montessori: A Biography. Oxford, Basil Blackwell. pp. 243-244.

15). The earliest reference appearing in England to Montessori and her work is most probably: May, M. G. (1909) 'A New Method in Infant Education'. Journal of Education. Vol. XXX1, September. pp. 645-647. Most sources have 1911, the year when an article on Montessori appeared in the Fortnightly Review. See: Cohen, S. 'The Montessori Movement in England, 1911-1952'. History of Education. Vol. 3, No 1. 1974. pp. 51-57.

16). Selleck op. cit. p.26.

17). See: Cremin, L. A.(1961) The Transformation of the School. New York, Vintage Books. p. 179. Graham, P. A. (1967) Progressive Education: From Arcady to Academe. New York, Teachers College Press. pp. 8-13. Lazerson, M. (1970)' Social Reform and Early-Childhood Education: Some Historical Perspectives'. Urban Education. No. 5, pp. 90-95. Lazerson, M. (1972) 'The Historical Antecedents of Early Childhood Education'. in Gordon, I. J. (ed.)

The Seventy-first Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. pp. 36-45. and Cavallo, D. (1976) 'From Perfection to Habit: Moral Training in the American Kindergarten'. History of Education Quarterly. Vol. 1. No. 2. pp. 147-161.

18) For critical discussions of this approach see: Abrams, P.(1982) Historical Sociology. Shepton Mallet, Open Books and McLennan, G. (1981) Marxism and the Methodologies of History. London, Verso.

19). The main studies of the Froebel movement in England are: Murray, E. R. [1912] A Story of Infant Schools and Kindergartens. London. Sir Isaac Pitman. Raymont, T. (1937) A History of the Education of Young Children. London, Longmans Green. Lawrence, E. (1952) (ed.) Friedrich Froebel and English Education. London, University of London Press. Lilley, I. M.' The Dissemination of Froebelian Doctrines and Methods in the English System of Elementary Education. 1854 to 1914.' Unpublished M.A. (Educ.). Kings College London, 1963. Another thesis which contains relevant material is: Adelman, C. 'The Institutionalisation of Kindergarten Curricula: An Ethnographic and Historical Account'. Unpublished Ph.D. London, Chelsea College. 1984.

20). What may be regarded as the founding text of the history of education in England conforms to this model. See: Quick, R. H. (1890) Essays on Educational Reformers. London. Longmans Green. (First edition 1868). Others in this *genre* which refer to Froebel include : Salmon, D. and Hindshaw, W. (1915) Infant Schools: Their History and Theory. London, Longmans Green. Rusk, R. R. (1933) A

History of Infant Education. London, University of London Press. and Lawrence, E. (1970) The Origins and Growth of Modern Education. Harmondsworth, Penguin.

21). For an example see: Burston, W. H. 'The Influence of John Dewey on English Official Reports'. International Review of Education, Vol. 7, December, 1961. pp. 311-23. Much that Burston attributes to the influence of Dewey could equally have been derived from any number of 'progressive' educationalists.

22). In part, the use of the notion of influence, and an uncritical approach to the Froebel movement, results from the fact that many of the texts being considered were written by sympathetic 'insiders'. For example : Elsie Riach Murray was a leading figure in the Froebel movement and Murray [1912] first appeared in the Froebelian journal, Child Life. Thomas Raymont was connected to several Froebelian organizations. In 1928, for example, he was President of the Froebel Society. Rusk (1933) was partly written to cover the Froebel Society's syllabus on the history of infant education. See: Times Educational Supplement, 7th October 1933. Lawrence (1952) was edited by the Director of the National Froebel Foundation. For a hostile view of Froebel which is primarily concerned with the influence of educational ideas see: Bantock, G. H. (1984) Studies in the History of Educational Theory. Vol. 11. London, George Allen and Unwin.

23). Mitchell, F. W. (1967) Sir Fred Clarke. London, Longmans, Green. pp. 78-79, p. 173 and p. 185.

24). Clarke, F. (1940) Education and Social Change. London, The Sheldon Press. p. 11, Note 1.

25). ibid. p. 6.

26). Mitchell, F. W. op. cit. p.166.

27). For an account of the development of the sociology of education in England see: Bernstein, B. (1972) 'Sociology and the Sociology of Education: Some Aspects'. Unit 17. E282. School and Society. Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

28). Williams, R. (1965) The Long Revolution. Harmondsworth, Penguin. pp. 161-165. A fourth 'argument' was also identified by Williams but he implied that it became manifest only in the Twentieth century.

29). Young, M. F. D. 'An Approach to the Study of Curricula as Socially Organised Knowledge' in Young, M. F. D. (1971) (ed.) Knowledge and Control. London, Collier-Macmillan. p. 29.

30). ibid. p. 41, Note 3.

31). Cosin, B. (1972) 'Ideology'. Unit 13. E282. School and Society.Milton Keynes, Open University Press. p. 139.

32). Cosin, B. (1972) 'Ideologies and Education'. Unit 14. E282. School and Society. Milton Keynes, Open University Press. p. 149.

33). Skilbeck, M. (1976) 'Ideologies and Values'. Unit 3. E203. Curriculum Design and Development. Milton Keynes, Open University Press. p. 10.

34). ibid. p. 23.

35). ibid.

36). ibid. p. 24.

37). For examples see: Lynch, J. (1979) Education for Community. London, Macmillan. pp. 53-73. and Meighan, R. (1981) A Sociology of Educating. London, Holt, Rinehart and Winston. pp. 154-199.

38). Finn, D., Grant, N. and Johnson, R. (1977) 'Social Democracy, Education and the Crisis'. in Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies. On Ideology. Birmingham, CCCS. pp. 147-198.

39). ibid. pp. 147-148.

40). ibid.

41). ibid. p. 178.

42). Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham, Education Group. op. cit. p. 28. For Larrain's discussion of ideology see: Larrain, J. (1979) The Concept of Ideology. London, Hutchinson. Larrain, J. (1982) 'On the Character of Ideology Marx and the Present Debate in Britain'. Theory Culture and Society. Vol. 1, No. 1. pp. 5-22. and Larrain, J. (1983) Marxism and Ideology. London, Macmillan.

43). Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J-C. (1977) Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture. London, Sage. pp. 177-178.

44). Donald, J. (1985)' Beacons of the Future: Schooling, Subjection and Subjectification'. in Beechey, V. and Donald, J. (eds.) Subjectivity and Social Relations. Milton Keynes, Open University Press. pp. 216-217.

45). ibid.

46). Hall, S. (1977) 'The Hinterland of Science: Ideology and the "Sociology of Knowledge"'. in Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies. On Ideology. Birmingham, CCCS. p. 10.

47). See for an assessment: Hall, G. S. and Mansfield, J. M. (1886) (eds.) Bibliography of Education. Boston, D. C. Heath. p. 12. His obituaries appear in Journal of Education. Vol. X111, April, 1891. pp. 221-227 and Monroe, W. S. (1913). ' Quick, Robert Herbert'. in Monroe, P. (ed.) A Cyclopedia of Education. Vol. 5. New York, Macmillan. pp. 99-100. Also useful is Monroe, P. and Kandel, I. L. (1912) 'History of Education' in Monroe, P. (ed.) A Cyclopedia of Education. Vol. 3. New York, Macmillan. pp. 296-297.

48). Quick (1890) op. cit. p. 522.

49). Selleck, R. J. W. (1968) The New Education. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. p. ix. and Selleck (1972) op. cit. In the latter text Selleck calls the progressives 'ideologists' but does not define the term. p. 73. Later he conflates progressive ideology with progressive theories. ibid p. 83.

50). Clarke op. cit. A characteristic contribution which exemplifies the point is: Sadler, M. E. (1902a) 'The Unrest in Secondary Education. In Germany and Elsewhere' in Board of Education Special Reports on Educational Subjects. Vol. 9. London, H.M.S.O. pp. ix-167.

51). The reaction of some on the Left to Entwistle's book on Gramsci which presented him as a marxist critic of progressive education exemplified the close articulation of progressive education with some varieties of Leftism . See Entwistle, H. (1979) Antonio Gramsci: Conservative Schooling for Radical Politics. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. For critical responses which defend progressive education see the contributions of Giroux and Holly in: Giroux, A. Holly, D. and Hoare, Q. (1980) 'Review Symposium: Antonio Gramsci: Conservative Schooling for Radical Politics'. British Journal of the Sociology of Education. Vol. 1, No. 3. pp. 307-325.

52). Larrain (1979) op. cit. p. 210.

Chapter 1

THE KINDERGARTEN SYSTEM.

1.0 Introduction.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a description of Froebel's main ideas and also of the practice of the kindergarten which was his unique contribution to the education of young children. However, although it is customary in most accounts of educational and pedagogic systems to begin with a description of their putative founders ideas and practices, this procedure has not gone unchallenged. Much of the criticism of this method, which is widespread in the history of ideas, emanates from structuralist and post-structuralist critics who share the propensity to abolish the author along with all other forms of the originating subject. In the face of such attacks it is necessary to justify the provision of an account of Froebel's ideas and practices and to adumbrate the purpose such an account is intended to serve. Without pre-empting that discussion too much, it may be argued that in the absence of such an account, however selective, the activities of the Froebel movement may only be partially comprehended. This is because the conceptual lexicon used by the Froebel movement constantly referred back to Froebel's work and without some knowledge of that lexicon much of the subsequent debate is unintelligible. Nevertheless, although this may be a sufficient justification for a consideration of Froebel's ideas and practices the enterprise is hazardous in that it risks falling into the same mode of explanation as the previously criticised 'Great Men' histories. These accounts are characterised by, among other things, the tendency to grant priority to

ideas in the explanation of changes in educational practices. In part, this is an effect of starting the history with an account of the life of the 'great man'. In this instance, the presentation of Froebel's ideas is not intended to imply that because it appears at the beginning of this study, those ideas alone were the cause of the changes in curricula and pedagogy which will be addressed in later chapters.

By posing the issue in this rather tentative way, some degree of effectivity or determinacy is granted to ideas. The question of determinacy in the relation between ideas and structure is a relatively old and a controversial one in sociology as well as, to a lesser extent, in history. This point is well illustrated by the debates over the thesis advanced by Weber in his The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. (1) Of more immediate concern here however, is the concomitant problem of the relation between thought and action or ideas and practices. Thus before commencing an account of Froebel's work, space will be devoted to a consideration of the nature of the relation between ideas and practices. Following this, attention will be paid to some formulations concerning systems of ideas and what it is about them, if anything, which may influence their careers. This discussion will provide the structure for the following section which will consider the educational ideas of Froebel. This will be followed by a final section which will examine the pedagogic practices advocated by Froebel. His practices will be dealt with rather differently to the treatment accorded to his ideas in that they will be described as they first appeared in England. The reason for so doing is that, unlike his ideas which were subjected to several transformations, the practice of the kindergarten in the private sphere of schooling, at

least, remained relatively undisturbed and unchanged for a long period. There is, therefore, no pressing need to provide a detailed account of the kindergarten in the earliest stages of its formation or to search for its true Froebelian 'essence'. Friedrich Froebel died in 1852. In the previous year, Johann and Bertha Ronge, liberal, political refugees from Germany, had arrived in London and they soon opened what was to be the first kindergarten in England.(2) Their kindergarten was situated first at Hampstead but it was later moved to Tavistock Place in London, in the vicinity of which, were to be located subsequently, many of the headquarters of movements involved in the promotion of reform in education.(3) As will be shown later, this kindergarten of the Ronge's was like many of those which followed it in that it was supported by wealthy families who were culturally adventurous. Among those, for example, whose children attended the Ronge's kindergarten was Frederic Davenport Hill who, as well as being a member of a family famous for their own experiments in education, was at different periods, an inspector of prisons and secretary to the postmaster-general.(4)

Thirty four years were to elapse after the founding of the Ronge's kindergarten before any of Froebel's writings were to appear in English translations. When it first became known in England therefore, the theory and practice of the kindergarten was derived from Froebel's own work by those, like Bertha Ronge, who had been his pupils, his assistants or his close supporters. Foremost among the latter was Baroness Bertha Von Marenholtz-Bülow (1810-1893), all of whose major work on the kindergarten had appeared in English before any of that of Froebel.(5) Only when Froebel's work began to be translated was it possible for a wider circle

of followers to conduct alternative readings to those of the Baroness and her fellow interpreters. Thus in terms of their interaction with events, Froebel's own ideas were, for a long period, of much less importance than those of others who claimed to be faithfully reproducing them.

2.0 Justifications for the Study of Froebel's Ideas.

In this sense, the 'real historical' Froebel is of limited relevance to a study of the Froebel movement. Moreover, unless a genetic approach, in which the social character of ideas is held to be given by the class position of those who are thought to be their authors, is adopted, then there is no particular necessity to attempt the recovery of the 'real historical', Froebel. (6) In contrast to this genetic approach, what is regarded here as being of much greater importance than the social origin of the ideas is the question of why Froebel's ideas were taken up and reproduced in the particular conjuncture that they were. Associated with this question is a further one concerning the functions which Froebel's ideas performed for those who assimilated and reproduced them.(7)

Nevertheless, a focus on the social function of ideas rather than their origin does not rule out their description. But despite the assaults of structuralists upon the concept of an author and upon the concept of an originating subject there is still, arguably, a space for persons to make history. In the view of structuralists such as Sollers, 'we are nothing more in the last analysis than our system of writing/reading'. (8) Thus, in this view, it was not Froebel who wrote but Froebel who was written. A similar conception appears in Foucault's disquisition entitled 'What is an Author?'.(9) In it, Foucault concluded that the author or the subject,

'must be stripped of its creative role and analysed as a complex and variable function of discourse'. (10) Why this 'must' happen is never revealed. However, it is not necessary to concur with the profound anti-humanism of structuralist thought in order to accept that a subject who takes on an authorial role is not the sole source of the outcomes of the performance of that role. This much, at least, was revealed by functionalist sociology with its theories of socialization and without charting the wilder shores of the notion of 'influence' and constructing complex genealogies it can easily be demonstrated empirically that Froebel worked with and upon ideas which were the common currency of Pestalozzi and Rousseau and many others who attained the status of an author and many who did not. Thus, Froebel's ideas cannot be said to have originated with him; many undoubtedly, may be traced to antiquity but that is of little importance. What matters most is the specific articulation of ideas and practices performed by agents or subjects and it is this that gives to subjects, such as Froebel, their significance.

In case it appears that the grounds for considering Froebel's ideas and practices are in danger of disappearing, there are other arguments for regarding such a consideration as essential. Firstly, as already has been mentioned, Froebel's ideas were re-worked and transformed by those who embraced and applied them. In Foucault's terminology, Froebel might be regarded as an example of the 'initiators of discursive practices' who produce not only their own work but also 'the possibility and the rules of formation of other texts'.(11) This particular route however, is to be rejected as not only are their evident difficulties in distinguishing between such initiators and other authors but Foucault's silence on the

question of agency puts his work outside the theories of ideology adopted here. In any case, the process of a return to, and the transformation of, an author's work is not uncommon in the field of education neither is it uncommon wherever ideas become 'party' or attached to the interests of social groups.(12)

An often observed response to the proliferation of different interpretations of an author's work is the exegesis of key texts which has as its object the recovery of the author's real or true meaning. However, such an enterprise is suspect because the producer of the exegesis can never be free from the operation of 'interests' and furthermore the 'real historical', author's meaning may not, in principle, be known. All that it is possible to produce is an abstraction constructed at a particular point in time and for a particular purpose. This is only a major problem when the partial nature of the abstraction is not recognized and when the purposes for which it was produced remain undisclosed. Moreover, although the true meaning of texts may be elusive some readings may be seen to be more adequate than others according to the extent to which they are faithful to the facts or to what is regarded as the work of an author.

Thus, in this instance, the account to be provided of Froebel's work is, although partial, regarded as necessary for the reason given above that it is useful, especially when dealing with a relatively obscure author, to provide some notion of the nature of the elements of the 'theories' which were subsequently, selectively appropriated by others.

A second argument for why a consideration of Froebel's ideas may be regarded as indispensable, consists in the simple truth that, in the last

instance it is inescapable that it was his ideas, or his specific articulation of a set of ideas and not those of others, which were taken up by those who constituted the Froebel movement. In other words, it may be argued that either in their form or their content or a combination of both, Froebel's ideas and practices had determinate effects which ensured their adoption while those of others did not. Conversely, it may be argued that only those specific ideas and practices were able to meet the objectively determined, material and symbolic needs of those who adopted them. Thus, both an idealist and a materialist case can be made for the importance of a consideration of Froebel's ideas and practices.

3.0 On the Relation Between Ideas and Practices.

Before Froebel's ideas and practices are discussed it is useful, from the point of view of the work of explanation that the discussion is intended to perform, to reveal something about the way in which the ideas have been selected and the assumptions which frame their presentation. First of all the rather unwieldy formulation of 'ideas and practices' has been deployed in order to indicate that ideas and practices are indissoluble. As the Italian Marxist, Antonio Gramsci, put it:

> There is no human activity from which every form of intellectual participation can be excluded: *homo faber* cannot be separated from *homo sapiens*. (13)

The nature of the relation between ideas and practices is however, often unclear. It is not necessarily one of logical entailment neither is it always one of correspondence between, on the one hand programmes and on the other, practices.(14) In addition, attempts to grant to one term, of the couplet ideas and practices, the power, in all cases, to determine the

other, are not satisfactory .(15) As the educationalist, Sir John Adams (1857-1934) once observed:

> The question of precedence between theory and practice involves a discussion that can result in very little advantage as will be evident to those who realise the inherent interdependence of the two.(16)

An acceptance of the proposition that ideas and practices are reciprocally determining does not preclude the possibility that in concrete situations one may be said to be more determinant than the other. Theories of pedagogy, for example, are often little more than *post hoc* rationalisations of practices which have been found to' work'.(17) Conversely, examples in education may also be adduced in which speculative ideas have, to adopt a phrase of Gramsci, 'produced a form of practical activity'. (18)

Problems such as these concerning the relation between ideas and practices are raised very sharply by Froebel's work. Adams, for example, argued that the kindergarten could not be derived from Froebel's ideas. Between his 'obscurely expressed truths about education' and the kindergarten, wrote Adams, 'there is a great gulf fixed'. (19) Adams, it ought to be noted, was no disinterested observer, he had his own Herbartian axe to grind but if the criterion adopted to evaluate the relation between Froebel's ideas and practices is one of logical entailment then, as will be demonstrated, Adams' point was valid.

4.0 Approaching ideas: Isaacs and Gouldner.

On the other hand, Nathan Isaacs, who in a later generation was as much committed to 'progressive' ideas as Adams had been, took the opposite view

of Froebel's work. He also presented a more complex notion than did Adams of the relation between Froebel's ideas and his practices. In his account , a number of levels were identified; these Isaacs called respectively, Froebel's 'total vision of the world', his 'educational principles' and his 'practical techniques'. (20) This approach of Isaacs bears certain resemblances to that of the sociologist, Alvin Gouldner who sought to distinguish different levels within what he termed, 'deliberately formulated social theories'.(21)

For Gouldner, such theories contained at least two distinguishable levels. The first of these he called 'postulations' and he argued that these consisted of 'explicitly formulated assumptions'. The other level identified by Gouldner consisted of what he called 'background assumptions'. These, he suggested, existed prior to postulations and they also lay behind the postulations and were obscured by them. In a further refinement of this analysis, Gouldner differentiated background assumptions into 'world hypotheses' and 'domain assumptions'.(22) The former, for Gouldner, referred to 'primitive presuppositions about the world' which served to:

> provide the most general of orientations which enable unfamiliar experiences to be made meaningful. (23)

The parallels here with some structuralist accounts of the way language works are noticeable for Gouldner may be interpreted as suggesting that world hypotheses form templates which organize experience and enable it to be read.(24) Like the rules of grammar, also, the world hypotheses structure other lower level background assumptions which he terms domain assumptions. These have less general applicability than world hypotheses

and they structure a single domain. Returning to Isaacs' typology, domain assumptions are comparable to his 'educational principles' and they also share features in common with Kuhn's 'paradigms'. (25)

The idealist thrust of both Isaacs' and Gouldner's thinking in this instance is unmistakeable. Beliefs at the level of world hypotheses structure lower level beliefs which in turn structure actions. In neither case is there any room for the possibility that actions may determine beliefs. This is because, in Gouldner's argument, world hypotheses are invested with considerable power. They may, he claims, be responsible for the '*social* career of a theory' because theories may be accepted or rejected on the basis of the background assumptions embedded within them rather than on the basis of their validity.(26) In proposing this, Gouldner came close to Koyré's position that 'extralogical factors' determined the acceptance or rejection of scientific theories and not always their explanatory power. (27)

The medium through which the assumptions are recognised and responded to, is argues Gouldner, language. One conceivable response to this revelation is to pose the question of how could it be otherwise but in this instance he is pointing out that the categories which constitute the domains are those which have been built up during the period in which language is acquired.(28)

As Gouldner's argument applies mostly to social theories they may not directly be transposed to Froebel's work because his work was far from the systematic presentation of a specific explanation which characterizes most theories. Moreover, his assumptions at the level of world hypotheses were not hidden but explicit and they litter his exposition with much cost to

its coherence and intelligibility. Nevertheless, there are no compelling reasons why only fully worked-up theories should be treated in this way and Gouldner's approach might easily, and usefully, be adapted to structure the presentation of such notoriously unsystematic work such as that of Froebel. Gouldner's approach has, among other things, the attraction that it raises the possibility that for some in the Froebel movement, the actual practice of the kindergarten was less important in securing their adhesion to that movement than Froebel's world hypotheses. A similar argument could be made, for example, which proposed that the Swedenborgian and Millenarianist elements in the work of the infant school pioneer, Samuel Wilderspin (1791-1866), were much more important in attracting support for his infant schools than was his pedagogy.(29)

5.0 Froebel's 'World Hypotheses'.

The most detailed exposition of his educational ideas which Froebel attempted appeared in his book, The Education of Man which was published in 1826. This was first translated into English and published in two versions in 1885. The translation most widely cited was that made by W.N. Hailmann who was the superintendent of schools, a post equivalent to a chief education officer, in La Porte, Indiana. Appropriately, for a work which is saturated with idealism, the preface to Hailmann's translation was written by someone who was one of America's leading Hegelians, the educationalist, William Torrey Harris. (1835-1908) (30)

5.1 Idealism In Froebel's Thought.

Froebel began The Education of Man by declaring that, 'in all things there lives and reigns an eternal law'.(31) This law was, for him, based upon, 'an all- pervading, energetic, living, self-conscious, and hence eternal

Unity' which he identified as God; the 'sole source of all things'. Immanent in all things, wrote Froebel, God's 'divine effluence' constituted the 'essence' of each thing and, for him, the 'destiny' of all things was to 'unfold their essence' and hence reveal God in their external being.(32) For man, as 'a rational being', a special destiny awaited; this was to become conscious of the inner, divine effluence and to know God. Thus, education was defined by Froebel as 'leading' man to a consciousness of the law of 'Divine Unity'.(33) But the revelation of the essence of man was best achieved if man' represented' himself, 'as much as possible in accordance with his individuality and personality'.(34) However, representation had to be threefold as man was related to , 'God, to nature and to humanity' and man comprehended within himself 'Unity (God), diversity (nature) and individuality (humanity)...' (35) Unless all three aspects were present, argued Froebel, representation would be imperfect and incomplete.

5.2 Pantheist and Naturalist Elements.

In these formulations there are observable elements of the 'nature philosophy' which was a tendency in contemporary German thought and which led to accusations that Froebel was a Pantheist. (36) Froebel, however, believed that the spirit of God 'works on and through nature' but 'God himself does not dwell in nature'.(37) Thus Froebel's position fell short of a fully Pantheistic view but the natural world, for him, was as much an educative force as it was for Pantheists like the young Wordsworth, with whom Froebel shared many other positions. (38) By following,' these silent, absolutely reliable, outwardly intelligible, impersonal teachers ,' wrote Froebel of nature:

> man may not only learn from them with certainty the thing to be done at every moment of life, but, acting accordingly , he will surely satisfy the demands made upon him. (39)

In addition to providing moral guidance, nature, according to Froebel, could provide man with self knowledge because, in his view:

> ...nature and man have their origin in one and the same eternal Being, and that their development takes place in accordance with the same laws only at different stages. (40)

In formulations such as this, Froebel dissolved the Kantian distinction between the phenomenal and the noumenal world. Some like Quick, and more recently Bowen, have seen in this aspect of Froebel's thought the beginnings of a science of education (41) and naturalistic passages such as this one appear to lend support to that view. Certainly, Froebel seems to be suggesting that there is no need for the Kantian division between noumena and phenomena for if things or nature develope according to the same laws which control the development of the spirit of man then a science which embraces both is possible. Thus he argued that, from his studies of crystallography, he had discovered that the laws which governed the development of crystals agreed remarkably with the laws which governed the development of the human mind. (42) However, the laws which Froebel spoke of were not laws which were amenable to empirical verification but the laws of a highly speculative metaphysics.

5.3 Froebel's Dialectics.

It was principally in The Education of Man that the laws, which Froebel held explained the working of the universe, were described. The most important of these, for his system, was called by him, the law of the connection of contrasts or the law of unification. This dialectical law consisted of the proposition that:

> Every thing and every being, [...] comes to be known only as it is connected with the opposite of its kind, and as its unity, [...] is discovered.(43)

In contrast to Hegel, whose dialectic applies only to thought, Froebel's dialectic applied to 'every living thing'.(44) In nature, according to Froebel, opposites were synthesised by a 'force' or 'a spontaneous energy equally active in all directions' and which was irreducible to anything but itself. The external form which this force took was that of a sphere which, said Froebel was, 'most commonly the first and the last form of things in nature'. (45)

The sphere was to occupy a central place in Froebel's pedagogic apparatus for, in addition to the sphere being the form that the force which overcame contradictions took, it was also, for him, a symbol of unity. Contradiction and the search for principles of unification lay at the very centre of Froebel's work. In a letter to Krause, a professor of philosophy at Jena and an expert on freemasonry, Froebel expressed the view that:

> there must exist somewhere some beautifully simple and certain way of freeing human life from contradiction.(46)

5.4 Mysticism and Symbolism.

The search for that 'simple and certain way' gained Froebel a reputation for obscure philosophy and more positively, for mysticism. Both of these

characteristics may be observed in the following passage where Froebel discusses the significance of the number five in the development of crystals and of 'life-forms':

> The number five, then, appears in nature and among life-forms as uniting the character of the numbers two and three; both in bisection and union, it appears as three and two. Hence, as developed under the influence of a life-force, it is truly the number of analytic and synthetic life, representing reason, unceasing self-development, self-elevation; for the higher the stage of development reached by the life-forms, the more persistent is this number.(47)

There is about this and other similar passages something almost cabalistic. It also contains echoes of Swedenborg the mystical thinker to whose ideas the English infant school founder, Wilderspin, was attracted (48) but the main strand in Froebel's world hypotheses is that of dialectics and idealism. A philosopher *manque*, he rarely failed to press his exposition in The Education of Man through the mould of antinomies and triadic formulae. This style gave to some of his work the flavour of a liturgy or incantation as may be seen in the following injunction that the educator:

> *...should make the individual and particular general, the general particular and individual, and elucidate both in life; he should make the external internal , and the internal external, and indicate the necessary unity of both; he should consider the finite in the light of the*

infinite and the infinite in the light of the finite and harmonize both in life.(49)

No matter how devoid of meaning such word play might appear, it is nonetheless recognisable as having connections with idealism and the fact that in the United States, at least, Hegelians were prominent in the promotion of Froebel's system may have had more than a little to do with Froebel's philosophical outlook.(50) Similarly, the educational allegiance of the Transcendentalists, of whom the poet Emerson is perhaps best known, was transferred from Pestalozzi to Froebel partly, it may be argued, because of the close similarity between Froebel's view of nature and their own. (51) Such links are more difficult to observe in England. As will be shown in Chapter 3, what was perhaps of more importance in attracting support here for Froebel's ideas and practices was not the specific nature of his world hypotheses but the religious aura, albeit an unorthodox one, which surrounded them. This religious aura was not coincidental for, in Froebel's era, any critique offered of existing practices of schooling and any alternatives that were put forward had, in the absence of a secular theory of education, to be constructed from within the discourse of religion.

6.0 Froebel's 'Educational Principles.

Having outlined some of the most important features of Froebel's view of the world it is now necessary to examine what may be regarded as his domain assumptions or as Isaacs called this level, 'Froebel's educational principles'. As has been noted, the aim of education stated by Froebel in The Education of Man was the attainment of consciousness of God. Through education, he declared:

> the divine essence of man shall be unfolded, brought out, lifted into consciousness, and man himself raised into free, conscious obedience to the divine principle that lives in him...(52)

This view of the purpose of education was linked by Froebel to a belief that, 'the undisturbed operation of the Divine Unity' was necessarily good. From this it followed that, left to itself, 'the young human being [...] would seek [...] that which is in itself best'. (53) In other words Froebel, like Rousseau and Pestalozzi, believed in the 'natural goodness' of all children in contrast to the doctrine of original sin which informed most Nineteenth Century educational ideas and practices and views of childhood. (54) He also held that growth, or has he termed it 'development', occured through the unfolding from within of the divine in man. Thus in a passage that was much quoted in the Froebel movement, Froebel declared that:

> education in instruction and training, originally and in its first principles, should necessarily be *passive, following* (only guarding and protecting), *not prescriptive, categorical, interfering.* (55)

Elsewhere he stressed that 'prescriptive and categorical, interfering education' must, 'of necessity, annihilate, hinder and destroy'. (56) A key element in his pedagogic message was, therefore, that growth should be unfettered and this was expressed in the famous plant metaphor in which the teacher or gardener was said to be successful if he 'passively and attentively' followed 'the nature of the plant'.(57) This he contrasted to

the sense empiricist view, which is commonly associated with John Locke (1632-1704) in which, according to Froebel:

> the young human being is looked upon as a piece of wax, a lump of clay, which man can mold into what he pleases.(58)

Whatever else it was, Froebel's thought was neither consistent nor coherent for having at several points insisted that education should not be a practice of intervention he also outlined the grounds upon which 'categorical, mandatory education' was permissible. These were mainly to do with instances in which, according to him, the 'original wholeness' of the child had been 'marred'. (59)

6.1 Froebel's Principles of Curriculum Construction.

Whether or not education was a passive process, it ought, argued Froebel - again implying the necessity for intervention - to be 'adapted to the pupil's nature and needs'.(60) In this adoption of what is generally referred to as a child-centred position, Froebel was following the naturalist path of Rousseau and Pestalozzi who had also made the child's nature, as they understood it, the starting point for the selection of a curriculum. But the pupil's nature and its needs were interpreted in a particular way. In Froebel's view, for example, the needs of the child did not coincide with 'extraneous aims', such as schooling intended to prepare for, 'a certain calling or sphere of activity', which he held was injurious, especially to young children. (61)

A necessary condition for the adaptation of education to the needs of the child is a description of those needs. This Froebel produced and he set it within a framework of several stages of development which he had

identified. These stages were labelled by him as the stages of infancy, childhood and boyhood [sic]. For Froebel it was particularly important that what are today sometimes referred to as the 'developmental tasks' of each stage were completed before the next stage was entered into.(62) Although the stages identified are not identical, the procedure of identifying stages of development and matching appropriate activities to them still informs current educational practice with regard to young children.

6.2 The Stage of Infancy.

To the stage of infancy or 'earliest childhood', a special significance was granted by Froebel as he held that in this period, if development was incomplete, there originated, 'the later most adverse and oppressive events' in the lives of adults. (63) This stage was characterised by him as one dominated by the emergence of the senses, first of hearing and then of sight. The order in which they emerged was given incorrectly by Froebel as a result of his attempt to show that the emergence of the senses conformed to the 'law of contrasts'.(64) Nevertheless, in this stage, he wrote, the child practised the use of its senses and limbs and its parents were enabled to establish the connection between 'objects and their opposites, *words* and *symbols*'.(65)

This reference to parents and their role is a common theme throughout Froebel's discussion of infancy. Sometimes parents are both described and addressed but more often it is mothers who Froebel directs his advice towards. In a key formulation, Froebel admits that his suggestions are carried out instinctively by 'the natural mother' but for him this is insufficient for, as he put it, it is:

> needful that she should do it consciously, as a conscious being acting upon another being which is growing into consciousness...(66)

6.3 Infancy.

When the child was able to objectify itself through the use of language Froebel's next stage, that of childhood began. This use of language indicated that the child, through 'self-activity', was making its 'inner' its 'outer'.(67) Parents, but particularly fathers, of children who were in this stage were enjoined to foster 'life in and with nature' and this was to be done chiefly through the medium of play. In a much quoted formulation, Froebel declared that:

> *Play* is the highest phase of child development-of human development at this period: for *it is self-active representation of the inner- representation of the inner from inner necessity and impulse.* (68)

This, and the statement that the plays of childhood were 'the germinal leaves of all later life', (69) indicate the central place given to play in Froebel's pedagogical theory. Froebel's view of the importance of children's play in their overall development was a distinctive feature of Froebel's pedagogy which, although it was not original, served to distinguish it from most contemporary views on education.

In this stage therefore, parents were to encourage play but they were also to engage in the 'training' of their children 'without being pedantic or too exacting'. They were to, 'connect the child's actions with suitable language' and to develope and cultivate the faculties of drawing, speech and number, all of which were held by Froebel, in conformity with the

psychological explanations of his time, to be innate.(70) The cultivation of the faculties was intended to lead children to think but in this stage they were also to be given habits of work and industry. Work, in Froebel's thought, was a means of creation and a means of representing the inner essence. In Froebel's most celebrated slogan, 'let us live with our children', parents were also advised to identify with the child's view of the world.(71) In his view, living with our children was, as for the Romantics, a means of recovering, 'the all-quickening creative power of child-life' which, he argued, adults no longer possessed.(72)

6.4 Boyhood

Between the ages of six and eight, the period of childhood gave way to that of boyhood [sic]. This was the stage when, for Froebel, 'instruction' should become dominant and his view of what should condition the selection of appropriate material for instruction is sharply differentiated from that of the preceding stages. Child-centredness is abandoned as, in this stage, instruction should be conducted:

> ...not so much in accordance with the nature of man as in accordance with the fixed , definite laws that lie in the nature of things. (73)

In the stage of boyhood what was done formerly for 'activity as such' was now done for a particular result. This, suggested Froebel, was exemplified in work for whereas previously the child imitated domestic labour now it participated in it. In play also, activity now has 'a definite, conscious purpose'. Through play, boys were moralized as they learned the virtues of; 'justice, moderation, self-control, truthfulness, loyalty' and 'brotherly love'. Play, in this stage, was the means, said Froebel, by which several

'civil and moral virtues' were awakened and cultivated. (74) In order to assist the inculcation of these virtues Froebel suggested that the plays of boyhood should be placed under special guidance and he urged that every town should have its own playground for boys.(75)

6.5 The Role of Work.

For this stage Froebel envisaged a form of education which would unite the school and the family, scholastic and domestic life. Boys, he urged, should be given domestic duties to perform and he attacked the, 'so-called Latin and high schools' for debarring pupils from, 'outwardly productive work'. (76) Although coming to the position that productive work and instruction ought to be combined from a very different point of departure to that of Marx, Froebel's prescriptions display many points of similarity with Marx's notion of polytechnic education.(77)

Froebel's argument for the inclusion of work in the education of children who had reached the stage of boyhood stated:

> that external, physical, productive activity interspersed in intellectual work strengthens not only the body but in a very marked degree the mind in its various phases of development. (78)

The similarities between the views of Marx and Froebel on this question need not lead to a search for evidence of the influence of one upon the other. In any event, Marx, as is well known, acknowledged the influence of Robert Owen upon his own rather fragmentary writing on education.(79) The main purpose in noting this common stress on the desirability of a place for work in the education of young children was to demonstrate that the view was not unique to Froebel. Indeed the advocacy of dependence on

things rather than words and upon the educative value of productive work was fairly common in many pedagogies which were constructed in opposition to those of the Enlightenment such as that of Locke.(80)

6.6 The Work of the School.

If the family's educative role during the period of boyhood was mainly to do with the provision of opportunities for labour, for Froebel, the work of the school was:

> *the conscious communication of knowledge for a definite purpose.(81)*

Although, as was noted above, Froebel had argued that in boyhood what should be taught ought now to conform to the laws which lay in the nature of things, he also elsewhere, and typically, argued the opposite. The question of what the school should teach to children in the stage of boyhood was, for Froebel in this other formulation, dependent upon a 'consideration of the nature and requirements of human development' at that stage. Knowledge of those requirements, he declared, could only be gained,' from the observation of the character of man in his boyhood'.(82) This apparent contradiction was 'resolved' by Froebel by reasserting that man and things were subject to the same laws. But despite his call for the observation of the character of man in boyhood, the fact that he asserted that the main need of a child in this stage was 'to feel his spiritual nature' suggests that his curriculum for this stage was derived not from observation but, like most of his other educational principles, from speculation.

7.0 Froebel's Principles of Pedagogy.

Laws derived from observation of an unsystematic kind do, however, appear in Froebel's work. His 'laws of human thought', for example, consisted of teachers' recipe, or commonsense, knowledge which contain elements drawn from observation. Similar laws formed much of what passed for pedagogical theory in the Nineteenth Century and for present-day teachers they also form a substantial proportion of the justifications which they offer for their practices.(83) For Froebel, the laws which governed the presentation of curriculum content were stated as the requirement to proceed' from the visible to the invisible and more abstract' and from 'the perception of individual things to the more general'. In another formulation, Froebel claimed that instruction would more closely approximate to life if it 'ascends from the particular to the general and then descends from the general to the particular'. (84) He also enunciated the law that:

> No new subject of instruction should be brought to the pupil unless he at least feels vaguely that it is based (...) on previous work.(85)

As well as these 'laws' of pedagogy, The Education of Man contains both elements of a theory of what today is referred to as motivation and of a theory of learning. With respect to the former, Froebel assumed the existence of certain predispositions in children such as a desire to discover the 'inner necessary unity' of all things. Such predispositions or needs, as he called them, ought, he argued, to be taken as the starting points for instruction.(86) But he also held the opposite view that before children could learn, their 'inner want' for instruction had first to be aroused. But whether the needs were already mobilised or they required arousal, activities such as reading and writing should begin, said Froebel,

only when, the 'inner need' and desire had 'manifested itself clearly and definitely'.(87) This notion of postponing reading and writing until the pupil was 'ready', was to be immensely important in distinguishing Froebelian from other pedagogies.

Regarding the elements of a theory of learning, these may be seen to be contained within general statements about pedagogy such as the following which held that the purpose of instruction was:

> to bring ever more *out* of man rather than to put more and more *into* him; for that which can get *into* man we already know and possess as the property of mankind, and every one, simply because he is a human being, will unfold and develop it out of himself in accordance with the laws of mankind. On the other hand, what is to come *out* of mankind what human nature is yet to develop, that we do not yet know.(88)

Similarly, for Froebel the role of teachers, ideally, was 'not the communication of knowledge already in their possession' but 'the calling forth of new knowledge'. They ought to observe and 'lead their pupils to observe, and render themselves and their pupils conscious of their observations'. (89) One of the problems with the first of these statements is that 'unfolding' is not a description of how learning takes place but an idealist proposition about the place of humanity in the order of things. Man at any moment, in this view, is not 'fixed or stationary' nor 'perfectly developed' but merely a phase in the unfolding or self-realisation of the divine. The second statement, on the other hand, does refer to learning despite being framed in the same language as the former

one. However, it has less to do with the positive effects of learning from observation than with Froebel's jaundiced view of culture which he described as the:

> oppressive burden and emptiness of merely extraneously communicated knowledge heaped up in memory.(90)

Learning by doing, on the other hand was viewed positively by Froebel. It was, for him' more developing, cultivating and strengthening' than learning which took place 'merely through the verbal communication of ideas'.(91)

7.1 Unresolved Contradictions.

In concluding this account of Froebel's educational principles, it is useful to note a number of unresolved tensions which may be identified in his thought. A major one of these consists in the tension between descriptions of childhood derived from observation and the requirements of the world hypotheses. In most instances that tension was resolved in favour of the latter. From the point of view of practice, the tension between an interventionist and a non-interventionist pedagogy was more marked. As has been indicated, Froebel tended to vacillate over this question but the most consistent line which he took was the one which deprecated 'the stamping and molding of children'.(92) Nevertheless, like Rousseau, what he substituted for molding, at the level of theory at least, was a system in which the shaping and direction of children was implicit rather than explicit. This, he argued, was because the 'direct precept fetters, hinders,' and represses whereas the 'indirect suggestion' gives inner freedom.(93) While Froebel's entire outlook could be said to mask and conceal real social relations this particular view conceals the inescapable dimensions of power and conflict within pedagogical relations

as all pedagogy involves, to some degree, the control and manipulation of learners. (94)

A further tension in Froebel's work which is less easily observed than the previous ones is that between existing forms of schooling and his own proposals. In a rare description of the conventional practice he sought to replace Froebel wrote of:

> an old woodcutter in winter, [who] in a dark, sooty room, drives into the heads of children the explanations of the small Lutheran catechism...(95)

Existing practices invariably shape those which reformers seek to replace them with. Revolt against convention takes convention as its starting point as in Rousseau's injunction to 'reverse the usual practice and you will almost always do right'.(96) Thus echoing Rousseau, Froebel is purported to have declared:

> I want the exact opposite of what now serves as educational method and as teaching-system in general.(97)

One possible consequence of adopting this position was Froebel's contradictory position on the nature of childhood and the question of molding for, in order to oppose extant practices, he had to take up some untenable positions of the kind labelled 'Utopian' by Bourdieu and Passeron. (98)

8.0 Froebel's 'Practical Technique'

Froebel's first title for the school which he established for young children was a *Kleinkinderbeschäftigungsanstalt* which may be translated as an institution where small children are occupied.(99) In 1840, he adopted

as an alternative for his school the name of 'kindergarten'. The name was soon extended to include not only the school but the system which he originated. Much of that system was prefigured in The Education of Man but it also received expression in his book of Mother's Songs which was published in 1843.(100) This collection of, mainly bucolic, songs, finger-plays, pictures and stories was addressed specifically to mothers but it contained much that was integrated into the practice of the kindergarten. Like his other work this book was suffused with symbolism. The title page, for example, depicts a mother who is singing and she is surrounded by her children. Froebel, in his commentary which accompanies the illustration, wrote that 'by song she is trying to interest them in Life's significance and all-sided harmony' and 'the plant she is tending and watering most carefully is a Lily, the flower of childhood and chilhood's Innocence'. (101) The commentary ends with the explanation that 'God's spirit is hovering near, as the heavenly Dove, to give the highest consecration to this faithful, motherly action.'(102) The sentimental and sacred tone is maintained throughout this book and in view of this it is somewhat ironic that, in 1851, the Prussian government ordered the suppression of the kindergartens on the grounds that they were 'socialistic' and that they aimed 'to teach children atheism'. (103) However, the songs and games are not significant because of their sentimentality but because they were designed to moralize the child and train its senses through the medium of play.

8.1 The Gifts and Occupations: Froebel's Pedagogic Apparatus.

The organization of play for educational purposes also lies behind the other main kindergarten activity ; the Gifts and the Occupations. These

were described by Froebel in a series of articles which, when collected and translated, appeared under the title of Pedagogics of the Kindergarten.(104) In England, Henry Morley observed their use in the Ronge's kindergarten and he introduced them to a wider audience by providing an account of what he had seen. Morley was a doctor who, in 1848, had opened his own school (105) and his description of the use of the Gifts and Occupations appeared first in 1855, in the journal Household Words which was edited by Charles Dickens.(106)

The apparatus which Morley saw being used was graded according to the age of the child. Infants were given the 'first gift' which was' a box containing six soft balls, differing in colour'. Its uses were described by Morley in the following way:

> Long before it can speak the infant can hold one of these little balls in its fingers, become familiar with its spherical shape and its colour. It stands still, it springs, it rolls. As the child grows , he can watch it with sharp eyes, and compare the colour of one ball with the colour of another, prick up his ears at the songs connected with his various games with it, use it as a bond of play fellowship with other children, practice with its first efforts at self-denial and so forth.(107)

The 'second gift' consisted of three wooden objects; a sphere, a cube and a cylinder. With these, obseved Morley, there is a great deal to be done and learned, including 'most of the elementary laws of mechanics'. (108) The gifts numbered three to six consisted of wooden cubes, variously divided. These, thought Morley, would 'manufacture many things' as well as teach

arithmetic and geometry. After the receipt of the seventh gift, a box containing all the preceding gifts, the 'little pupil' at seven years old, would have had, according to Morley:

> his inventive and artistic powers exercised, and his mind stored with facts that have been absolutely comprehended.(109)

The use of play materials of this kind is prefigured in one of the very few passages in The Education of Man where Froebel discusses a child in a way that might well have been based on observation. Even so, the infant described apparently could not refrain from an excursion into elementary logic:

> he is attracted by the bright, round smooth pebble, by the gayly-colored, fluttering bit of paper, by the smooth, symmetrical, three-or four-cornered piece of board, by the rectangular blocks of wood for building, by the brilliant, quaint leaf and he tries to get hold of these with the help of the newly acquired use of his limbs , to bring like things together, and to separate things that are unlike.(110)

Unsurprisingly, the actual choice of the form of the gifts was determined not so much by what objects children were seen to play with but by what has been referred to here as Froebel's world hypotheses. The significance to Froebel of the sphere, which comprised the first gift, has already been noted. Its significance as a gift was explained by Froebel in The Pedagogics of the Kindergarten in the following passage:

> In and by means of the ball (as an object resting in itself, easily moveable, especially elastic, bright and warm) the child perceives his life, his power, his activity, and that of his senses, at the first stage of his consciousness, in their unity and thus exercises them [...]
>
> The sphere is to the child the representative of every isolated simple unity; the child gets a hint in the sphere of the manifoldness as still abiding in unity. (111)

In a similar way, Froebel argued that his second gift illustrated his 'law of connection of contrasts'. The contrasts were formed by the ball and the cube and the cylinder, supposedly containing both, was that which connected and united them. This gift, thought Froebel, would enable children to perceive the nature and destiny of man.(112)

8.2 The Occupations.

In addition to the gifts, Froebel's pedagogic system contained other materials for activity and instructions on how they could be used. The distinction between the gifts and the occupations was not made very clear by Froebel but the occupations appear to have been produced in order to apply and practise that which had been learned from the gifts.(113) The occupations which Morley saw in use included stick laying, pea-work (modelling with sticks joined together with peas) and stick plaiting. After those occupations, Morley wrote, 'there is a world of ingenuity to be expended on the plaiting, folding cutting, and pricking of plain or coloured paper'. (114) After the age of six, modelling in wet clay was one

of the most common occupations in the Ronge's kindergarten. For Froebel, the modelling of plastic, soft material in accordance with the laws indicated by the cubical form was 'profitable' for those who 'had attained a certain degree of mental power'(115) He also believed that drawing on slates, which had been ruled into squares, taught' the eye a knowledge of symmetry and trains the hand in representing them' and such drawing was a commonplace in the early kindergartens. (116)

In addition to recording the use of the gifts and occupations, Morley also provided an account of the other characteristic kindergarten activities; songs, games and stories.

He recommended, in line with the Ronge's practice, that every 'infant garden' should have its own garden where each child could observe the growth of plants. The notion of nature as a teacher in Froebel's thought has already been discussed but in advocating the practice of gardening he also connected it to work. Boys should have gardens to cultivate, he argued, so that they might see for the first time their work 'bearing fruit in an organic way, determined by logical necessity and law' and also to satisfy their desire to know nature, as well as to 'guard and foster their own lives'.(117)

In Morley's article reference was also made to what perhaps distinguished kindergarten pedagogy most from other pedagogies. This article of Froebelian faith insisted that:

> up to the age of seven there is to be no book work and no ink work; but only at school a free and brisk but systematic strengthening of the body, of the senses, of the intellect, and of the affections, managed in such a

> way as to leave the child prompt for subsequent instruction, already comprehending the elements of a good deal of knowledge.(118)

This prohibition of writing and reading in the kindergarten was based upon Froebel's view, which was cited above, that an 'inner need' must have manifest itself clearly before a new activity such as reading could commence and this need did not emerge before the age of seven.

Like so many subsequently who, having encountered a system of education they believe to be the philosopher's stone, Morley included a rhapsodic evaluation of the practice of the kindergarten. He wrote:

> we have been perfectly amazed at the work we have seen done by the children of six or seven - bright, merry creatures, who have all the spirit of their childhood active in them, repressed by no parent's selfish love of ease and silence, cowed by no dull-witted teacher of the ABC and the pothooks.(119)

A very different image indeed to that provided of some existing infant schools by HMI Joseph Fletcher, only a few years previously. In these schools, he reported, infants were required:

> to work very doggedly in reading-drafts on the old plans, and to learn off by heart texts and recitations, which they do not understand, to be repeated, *in display* before the school. (120)

Nevertheless, even if these descriptions are regarded as accurate, it would not be legitimate to infer from them that the Ronge's kindergarten was pedagogically superior to the infant schools solely as a result of the

adoption of Froebel's ideas and practices; differences of a material nature such as the size of the class and the ability of the teachers need also to be taken into account.

9.0 Conclusion.

Of necessity, much has had to be left out in this survey of Froebel's ideas and practices. Nonetheless, enough has been presented of Froebel's thought and of the kindergarten system to fulfil the intention of describing their main elements. One of the most noticeable and striking of these is the way that a particular kind of home, one which still retained functions of production, provided the model for Froebel's system. This, it should be stressed, was at a time when the factory was increasingly the institution that schools sought to emulate. This utilisation of the home together with Froebel's theories of play and self-realisation through activity contrasted strongly with the dominant Nineteenth Century view of working class schooling as preparation for work not in the vocational sense but in the sense of socialization into the modes of behaviour appropriate for work. Other contrasts with prevailing notions were provided by Froebel's child-centred approach to the schooling of children in their early years and the advocacy of the 'indirect suggestion' in matters of discipline.

All these aspects of Froebel's pedagogy ensured, that contrary to his stated intentions, his ideas and practices were directed principally to the schooling of young children; an area in which the socialising functions divided between home and school are more important than the socialising functions shared by school and place of work. But even in this field,

Froebel's system had an oppositional character, a theme which will be developed more fully in Chapter 3.

With regard to Froebel's pedagogic apparatus, based as it was on a mixture of observation and dialectics much of it and the Mother's Songs, regarded from the vantage provided by the present, appears if not absurd then a little fanciful. But Froebel worked, as far as education is concerned, before, to borrow a phrase from the 'nature philosopher' and poet Friedrich Schiller, the 'disenchantment of the world'. (121) Taken up by Weber and situated within his problematic of rationalization, the phrase refers to the degree to which magical elements of thought are displaced and correspondingly, to the extent to which 'ideas gain in systematic coherence and naturalistic consistency'. (122) Froebel's educational ideas, in this sense, may be said to have been pre-scientific. However that is not to judge them from a standpoint of rationality of 'science' or psychology. The latter merely provide alternative rationalisations to those of Froebel for educational practices, not necessarily 'better' ones. Moreover, there is little to be gained from demonstrating the inadequacy of Froebel's psychology unless it is set within the context of his time. The standards of the present are not an appropriate measure by which to evaluate this aspect of Froebel's system. What matters most is that Froebel, as W.T.Harris emphasised, provided a philosophical justification for his educational practice and that his practice may be judged to have been superior to the ABC and the pothooks as far as young children were concerned. Not their coherence then, nor their truth claims but the function of Froebel's ideas and practices is what matters most when considered from the point of view of theories of ideology.

Chapter 1

FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES.

1). Weber, M. (1952) The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. London, Allen and Unwin.

2). Bertha Ronge had been a pupil of Froebel and Johann Ronge had been elected to the Frankfurt Parliament during 1848. See Woodham Smith, P (1952a) 'The Origin of the Kindergarten' in Lawrence, E. (ed.) Friedrich Froebel and English Education. London, University of London Press. p.36. and Stewart, W. A. C. and McCann, W. P. (1967) The Educational Innovators 1750-1880. London, MacMillan. p. 300. The Ronges' book on kindergarten practice became a standard reference for Froebelians in England. See: Ronge, J. and Ronge, B. (1865) A Practical Guide to the English Kindergarten. London, A. N. Myers. First edition 1855.

3). Ronge, J. and Ronge, B. op. cit. p. v. Froebel, F.(1915) (12th ed.) Autobiography of Friedrich Froebel. (Translated by Michaelis, E. and Moore, H. K.) London, Swan Sonnenschein. p. 166. Stewart and McCann op. cit. p. 304. Salmon, D. and Hindshaw, W. op. cit. p. 117. Murray, E. R. op. cit. p. 66. Raymont, T. op. cit. p. 182.

4). Ronge, J. and Ronge, B. op. cit. p.v. For Hill see Stewart, W. A. C. (1972) Progressives and Radicals in English Education 1750-1970. London, Macmillan. p. 55.

5). The main texts and the date of their first English translation are: Froebel, F. (1885a) The Education of Man. (Translated by Jarvis, J.) New York, A. Lovell and Co. also Froebel, F. (1885b)

The Education of Man. Translated by Hailmann, W.N. New York, London, D. Appleton Century. Froebel, F. (1885c) Mother's Songs, Games and Stories. (Translated by Lord, F. and Lord, E.) London, W. Rice.

Froebel, F. (1886) Autobiography of Friedrich Froebel. (Translated by Michaelis, E. and Moore, H. K.) London, Swan Sonnenschein.

Froebel, F. (1887) Letters on the Kindergarten. Translated by Michaelis, E. and Moore, H. K. London, Swan Sonnenschein.

The last of the works of the Baroness to appear in English was Marenholtz Bülow, B. von. (1883) Hand-work and Head-work. (Translated by Christie, A. M.) London, Swan Sonnenschein. On the Baroness see Shirreff, E. A. (1893) 'Baroness von Marenholtz-Bulow' Journal of Education. Vol XV, May.pp. 250-252 and 'Marenholtz-Bülow-Wendhasen, Bertha Von' in Monroe, P. (1914) (ed.) A Cyclopedia of Education. Vol 4. New York, Macmillan. p. 139.

6). For a recent example of this approach see: Sharp, R. (1980) Knowledge, Ideology and the Politics of Schooling. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. In particular, her treatment of Veblen, Weber, Durkheim and Mannheim.

7). This approach is similar to that proposed by Goldmann. See: Goldmann, L. (1969) The Human Sciences and Philosophy. London, Jonathan Cape. pp. 92-93.

8). Quoted by Strickland, G. (1980) 'Sructuralism: A Retrospective View'. The Literary Review, No 16, May. pp. 47-48.

9). Foucault, M. (1979) 'What is an Author?'. Screen, Vol. 20, No 1. p. 28.

10). ibid. p. 28.

11). ibid. p. 24.

12). A phenomenon which led Marx to declare 'All I know is that I am not a Marxist'. Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1934) Selected Correspondence 1846-1895. (Edited and translated by Torr, D.) London, Martin Lawrence. For a general discussion of this point see: Eastman, G. (1967) 'The Ideologizing of Theories: John Dewey's Educational Theory, a Case in Point'. Educational Theory. Vol. 17, No. 2. pp. 103-119. The notion of an 'ideological party' is discussed by Gramsci in: Gramsci, A. (1971) Selections from the Prison Notebooks. (Edited and translated by Hoare, Q. and Nowell Smith, G.) London, Lawrence and Wishart. p. 372.

13). ibid. p. 9.

14). For a discussion see: Smart, B. (1983) Foucault, Marxism and Critique. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. pp. 115-116.

15). Within certain works of Marx and Engels, practices are held to be historically prior to ideas as well as being the basis of ideas. See: Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1974) The German Ideology. London, Lawrence and Wishart. p. 47. and p. 58. For a critical discussion see: Williams, R. (1977) Marxism and Literature. Oxford, Oxford University Press. pp. 58-62.

16). Adams, J. (1912) The Evolution of Educational Theory. London, Macmillan. p. 7. See also Gramsci op. cit. pp. 334 and 364-365.

17). For an example see: Parkhurst, H. (1927) Education on the Dalton Plan. London, G. Bell.

18). Gramsci op. cit. p. 328. For an educational example see: Rousseau, J-J. (1974) Émile. (Translated by Foxley, B.) London, J. M. Dent.

19). Adams, J. [1897] The Herbartian Psychology Applied to Education. London, D. C. Heath. p. 40

20). Isaacs, N. (1952) 'Froebel's Educational Philosophy in 1952'. in Lawrence, E. (ed.) Friedrich Froebel and English Education. London, University of London Press. p. 180.

21). Gouldner, A. W. (1971) The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology. London, Heineman. p. 29.

22). ibid. pp. 30-31.

23). ibid. p. 30.

24). See Larraine (1979) op. cit. pp. 130-153.

25). Kuhn, T. S. (1970) 'The Structure of Scientific Revolutions' in Neurath, O. (ed) International Encyclopedia of Unified Science. Vol. 2, No. 2.

26). Gouldner op. cit. p. 29.

27). Cited in Merquior, J. G. (1985) Foucault. London, Fontana. p.41.

28). Gouldner op. cit. pp. 32-33.

29). See McCann and Young op. cit.

30). For Harris see: Cremin, L. A. (1961) The Transformation of the School. New York, Alfred A. Knopf. pp. 14-20. and Karier, C. J. (1967) Man, Society, and Education. Glenview, Illinois, Scott Foresman. pp. 99-100.

31). Froebel (1885b) op. cit. p. 1.

32). ibid. p. 2.

33). ibid..

34). ibid. p. 20.

35). ibid. p 17.

36). For a discussion see: Bowen, H. C. (1901) Froebel and Education by Self-Activity. London, William Heinemann. p. 95. and Boyd, W. (1952) The History of Western Education. London, Adam and Charles Black. (6th ed.) p. 353.

37). Froebel. (1885b) op. cit. p. 155.

38). Bowen op. cit. frequently compared Wordsworth and Froebel in his exposition of Froebel's thought as did the Herbartian, F. H. Hayward. See Hayward, F. H. (1905) The Educational Ideas of Pestalozzi and Froebel. London, Ralph, Holland. Hayward, saw behind Froebel and Wordsworth the influence of Rousseau. For a discussion of the relation between the thought of Rousseau, Wordsworth and Froebel see: Featherstone, J. (1978) 'Rousseau and Modernity'. Daedalus. Vol. 107. No. 3. pp. 167-192.

39). Froebel (1885b) op. cit. p. 159.

40). ibid. p. 161

41). Bowen, J. (1981) A History of Western Education. Vol. 3. London, Methuen. p.339. also Quick op. cit. p. 413.

42). Froebel (1885b) op. cit. p. 71.

43). ibid. p. 42.

44). ibid. Hailmann's footnote.

45). ibid. pp. 167-169.

46). Froebel (1915) op. cit. p. 108.

47). Froebel (1885b) op. cit. p. 192. This was too much even for a sympathizer like Bowen who wrote that the number had 'as many

mystic meanings as *abracadabra*'. See Bowen op. cit. p. 46. On the mystical strand in Froebel's thought see: Lilley, I. (1967) Friedrich Froebel. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. pp. 15-18.

48). For an argument which maintains that Froebel utilised Swedenborgian ideas see: Sewall, F. (1896) The Angel of the State.Boston, E. A. Whiston.

49). Froebel (1885b) op. cit. pp. 15-16.

50). The two leading revisers of Froebel in the United States, G. Stanley Hall and John Dewey were both, originally, Hegelians who contributed to the Journal of Speculative Philosophy, an idealist periodical begun by Harris. See: Karier op. cit. p. 99 and Cremin op. cit. pp. 14-15.

51). Of the Transcendentalists connected with education in the United States, the best known is the Pestalozzian, Amos Bronson Alcott (1799-1888). His assistant at the Temple School, Elizabeth Palmer Peabody (1804-1894) was a leading expositor of Froebel's system. Monroe, W. S. (1911) 'Alcott, Amos Bronson' in Monroe, P. (ed.) A Cyclopedia of Education. Vol. 1. New York, Macmillan. pp. 83-84.

52). Froebel (1885b) op. cit. pp. 4-5 and p. 128.

53). ibid. pp. 7-8.

54). ibid. p. 120. For Rousseau on natural goodness see: Rousseau op. cit. p. 56. and for Pestalozzi: Silber, K. (1965) Pestalozzi, the Man and His Work. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. (2nd ed.) pp. 37-38 and Heafford, M. R. (1967) Pestalozzi. London, Methuen. p.61.

55). Froebel (1885b) op. cit. p. 7.

56). ibid. p. 9 and pp. 218-219.

57). ibid. p. 9, p. 75 and pp. 242-243. The plant metaphor was also used by Pestalozzi. See: Selleck (1968) p. 182.

58). Froebel (1885b) op. cit. p. 8.

59). ibid. p. 10.

60). ibid. p. 14.

61). ibid. p. 30.

62). ibid. p. 28 and p. 30. For the concept of developmental tasks see: Erikson, E. H. (1963) Childhood and Society. New York, Norton.

63). Froebel (1885b) op. cit. pp. 20, 24 and 56.

64). ibid. p. 45.

65). The basis for this was Pestalozzi's notion of '*Anschauung*' - the immediate experience of objects. See: Rusk, R. R. (1954) The Doctrines of the Great Educators. London, Macmillan. (2nd ed.) pp. 193-196.

66). Froebel (1885b) op. cit. pp. 64-65.

67). ibid. pp. 40, 50 and 92.

68). ibid. pp. 54-55.

69). ibid.

70). ibid. pp. 75, 79 and 81.

71). ibid. p. 89.

72). ibid. pp. 87-89.

73). ibid. pp. 94-95.

74). ibid. pp. 113-114.

75). ibid. pp. 114 and 304.

76). ibid. pp. 230, 236-237.

77). Marx, K. (1976) Capital. Vol. 1. Harmondsworth, Penguin. pp.614-619. Marx, however, quotes approvingly a criticism of the German educator J. B.Basedow (1724-90) whose advocacy of the use of play methods and dependence on 'things' anticipated Froebel. On Basedow see Boyd op. cit. pp. 307-311. For a discussion of polytechnic education see: Castles, S and Wüstenberg, W. (1979) The Education of the Future. London, Pluto. pp. 6-42.

78). Froebel (1885b) op. cit. p. 236.

79). Marx (1976) op. cit. p. 614.

80). Rusk (1954) op. cit. pp. 114-134.

81). Froebel (1885b) op. cit. p. 95.

82). ibid. p. 137.

83). See: Spencer, H. (1929) Education: Intellectual, Moral and Physical. London, John Watts. pp. 67-74. (1st ed. 1861). For some recent views see: Parsons, J. M., Graham, N. and Honess, T. (1983) 'A Teacher's Implicit Model of How Children Learn'. British Educational Research Journal. Vol. 9. No. 1. pp. 91-101 and Howe, M. J. A. (1982) 'The Psychology of Learning and the Learning of Psychology'. Education Section Review. Vol. 16 . No. 2. pp. 66-72.

84). Froebel (1885b) op. cit. pp. 81, 83, 252 and 258.

85). ibid. p. 314.

86). ibid. pp. 97, 102-103, 105 and 223.

87). ibid. pp. 223-225.

88). ibid. p. 279.

89). ibid. p. 200.

90). ibid. p. 230.

91). ibid. pp. 279 and 312.

92). ibid. pp. 8, 231 and 280.

93). ibid. pp. 267 and 279.

94). For a classic sociological statement regarding the inherently conflictual nature of pedagogic relations which involve adults and children see: Waller, W. (1965) The Sociology of Teaching. New York, John Wiley.(1st ed. 1932). See also Geer, B. (1971) 'Teaching' in Cosin, B. R., Dale, I. R., Esland, G. M., and Swift, D. F. (eds.) School and Society. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. pp.3- 8.

95). Froebel (1885b) op. cit. pp. 124, 130 and 135.

96). Rousseau op. cit. p. 58.

97). Froebel (1915) op. cit. p. 116.

98). Bourdieu and Passeron op.cit. pp. 16-17.

99). Bluhm, S. (1971) 'Friedrich Froebel' in Deighton, L. C. (ed.) The Encyclopedia of Education. Vol. 4. New York, Macmillan. p. 103.

100). Froebel (1900a).

101). ibid. p. 117.

102). ibid. p. 118.

103). Bowen, H. C. op. cit. p. 41.

104). Froebel, F. (1900b) Pedagogics of the Kindergarten. (Translated by Jarvis, J.) London, Edward Arnold.

105). Stewart op. cit. pp. 110-111.

106). It is usually attributed to Dickens by 'official' historians of the Froebel movement. See: Murray op. cit. p. 68. Raymont op. cit. p.

194 and Woodham Smith (1952) op. cit. p. 37. The case for Morley was made in Collins, P. A. W. (1955) 'A Note on Dickens and Froebel' National Froebel Foundation Bulletin. June. pp. 15-18. The article appears in full in Roscoe, J. E. (1915) The Dictionary of Educationists. London, Sir Isaac Pitman. pp. 104-123.

107). ibid. p. 115.

108). ibid. p. 116.

109). ibid. p. 119.

110). Froebel (1885b) op. cit. p. 72.

111). Froebel (1900b) op. cit.p. 102.

112). ibid. p. 92 and Froebel (1885b) op. cit. p. 43. Hailmann's note.

113). Bowen op. cit. p. 146.

114). Roscoe op. cit. p. 120.

115). Froebel (1885b) op. cit. p. 284.

116). ibid. p. 294.

117). ibid. pp. 111-112.

118). Roscoe op. cit. p. 109.

119). ibid. p. 121. The following is characteristic: Board of Education (1912) The Montessori System of Education. Educational Pamphlets, No. 24. London, HMSO. (Written by E. G. A. Holmes). p. 20.

120). Fletcher, J. (1845) 'Report on Infant Schools on the Principles of the British and Foreign School Society aided from Parliamentary Grants' in Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education 1845. Vol. 2. London, HMSO. p. 228.

121). Gerth and Mills, op. cit. p. 51. Bowen (1981) op. cit. p. 336. implies that Froebel was influenced by Schiller.

122). ibid.

Chapter 2

EDUCATIONAL EXPERTS AND THE POLITICS OF EDUCATION IN THE LATE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

1.0 Introduction.

This Chapter is concerned with the political and ideological context into which, in England, Froebel's ideas and practices were inserted; matters which are not normally addressed in discussions of the Froebel movement or in accounts of similar educational movements. This approach is predicated on the assumption that in a given social formation everything is related to everything else and that ideological conflicts over the purposes of schooling have effects on practices as far distant from the centres of those struggles as the schooling of young children. This in itself, however, is an insufficient reason to look at the politics of education during the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries. After all, it might be proposed, on the basis of the same assumption, that demographic changes during the period should be given equal weight in the study of the determinants of infant schooling. The response to that objection is that not everything in a social formation has the same power to shape events as that of the political, broadly conceived. To take the political, which is concerned primarily with relations of power, as the key source of determination is to appear to depart from the insistence of classical marxism on the economic base as that which ultimately determines history. The question, however, is not one of fidelity to a particular version of marxism but one of what may best explain the

phenomena under discussion. This does not mean that the role of the economic in determining some of the outcomes observed is ignored but it is to argue that the economic may not be the most appropriate level of abstraction with which to illuminate this particular object.

In the introduction to this study, a distinction within the literature on educational ideology was noted. This distinction refers to educational ideologies which have as their focus the purposes of education and educational ideologies within education which have more to do with curricula and pedagogy. This Chapter is concerned with the former. Ideas within education, such as those associated with Froebel, are linked to relations of power and to the extent that they are, they may also function as ideologies. However, although ideas and practices within education may frequently refer to the purposes of schooling and relate to social, political and economic objectives , their bearers rarely seek to gain the support of large numbers, as do those involved in struggles over the purposes of schooling, but simply strive to achieve hegemony over what Skilbeck calls the 'pedagogic community'. In order to do this, however, they must form alliances, however tacit, with forces struggling over the purposes of education and forces within the political arena generally or within the state. This is because power to define the content and practice of education is not solely or even mainly located within schools, colleges and universities. Instead, it lies outside them, particularly in those arenas of the state where decisions are made about finance and expenditure, organization and administration. Thus an account of the state and its apparatus specifically constructed for the purpose of regulating schooling ought to be present in any history of ideas and practices in

schooling and not be confined to the desiccated realms of the history of educational administration.

The structure of this Chapter is as follows. Firstly, the period with which this study is concerned will be defined as one riven by crises and the effects of that on schooling will be discussed. Following that, a sketch of the most pertinent aspects of the politics of education during the period will be provided together with a reference to the rise of the state educational expert. Accounts which deny to experts involved in administration power to make policy are clearly incomplete (1) as are those accounts of the growth of government which deny a role in policy formation to politicians.(2) Here, experts will be considered with the aid of Gramsci's theory of intellectuals. This leads to a consideration of the nature of the power bloc during the period and to an argument which links ideologies in education to intellectuals aligned with fractions within the power bloc. The Chapter will end with a consideration of the concept of modernization which opens up the possibility that the Froebel movement may be seen as a component in the struggle to modernize late Nineteenth Century schooling.

2.0 The Context: A Crisis of Hegemony.

There is among many historians and others a general agreement that in the 1880's there began a long and deep crisis or a series of crises which persisted until the 1920's. (3) By this decade, the state had been, to a large extent, transformed from a relatively *laissez faire* one to an interventionist and representative one. In a corrective to reductionist accounts, Johnson has argued that the crises, 'were by no means a simple product of economic developments'. (4) Undoubtedly that was so but the

crisis, as it appeared in the 1880's to many experts on and within education who witnessed its onset, was, if only for a relatively short period, fundamentally an economic one.(5) The crisis did however have a political dimension which was brought about by what may, in shorthand, be best referred to as the rise of labour and which was manifest in the fracturing of liberalism. The former aspect of the political crisis, the rise of labour, impinged most on education. The transition to a form of representative democracy which it engendered entailed the granting of a measure of political citizenship to the male working class. This, in turn, produced a renewed interest in the education of 'our masters' and particularly in the forms of knowledge thought appropriate for these new citizens. But whether for economic or political reasons or, as W.E.Forster's speech in 1870 indicates, for a combination of both, schooling began increasingly to be seen as an essential part of any strategy which sought a route out of the crisis.(6)

2.1 The Economic Crisis.

From the point of view of its effects on educational discourse, this aspect of the crisis took two main forms: a rapid increase in foreign industrial competition and the recomposition of the labour force. With regard to the first of these aspects, from the 1880's onwards, the rate of increase in British industrial output declined relative to that of the United States and Germany.(7) Britain's loss of industrial supremacy although sudden was not general but confined to a number of key sectors such as the electrical and chemical industries.(8) Significantly, these were sectors in which the use of science as a force of production was most developed. This, together with the greater attention paid to schooling, at all levels,

in Germany and the United States, made plausible arguments which linked industrial performance to a modern system of schooling in which all parts were joined in a coherent whole and scientific and technical knowledge was highly valued. This argument was advanced particularly by those who were actively involved in the production of scientific and technical knowledge. One result of which is that in the 1880's version of the school/industry debate it is difficult to untangle the specific interests of the scientists and their allies from the general interest of the nation. Thus it is as useful, from the point of view of developments within education during the 1880's, to regard contemporary perceptions of industrial decline as much a social fact as was the 'real' situation which has been measured, by Selleck for example, by declining pig-iron production statistics.(9)

A flavour of the perceptions of decline may be gained from one who was not a scientist nor one of their allies but who nevertheless expressed the notion, which lay at the heart of the schools/industry debate, that schooling was an instrument of national survival. This was the prominent educationalist, Michael Sadler who in an article written in 1902 exemplified the position of those who sought to recruit schools to the international struggle for survival and to mobilise the state into greater action in education. Of Britain's main rivals he wrote that:

> The methodical perserverance, the scientific precision and the patient forethought of the German, with the unresting activity, the brilliant dash and ingenuity of the American, constitute a very formidable pair of rivals contending for commercial supremacy. Each of the two

> makes his schools help him in preparing for the struggle in which he is engaged. We alone among the nations of the world seem to regard education as a bore. (10)

The view that schools could have positive effects upon economic performance also emerged during a period when demands for new forms of labour and new kinds of workers such as clerks, technicians and engineers were rapidly increasing. (11) Sectors such as retailing, marketing, distribution, banking and finance all underwent a considerable expansion which was linked to what Hobsbawm has described as a 'retreat from industry into trade and finance'.(12) This, in turn, was associated with imperialism and the development of an international system of commerce and finance which had at its centre the City of London. (13)

2.2 Political Aspects of the Crisis.

With respect to elementary schooling, the political question which it was most often expected to provide an answer to was that of how, if formal democracy was to be extended to the entire male working class, could political power be used judiciously by that class so that its position of subordination remained unaltered. This problem brings into focus the ideological work of elementary schools which was crystallised in the presence in school of the drill sergeant and the imperialist content of the history and geography books.(14) At a more general level, as will be shown in Chapter 8, it led to pressure for 'man-making' or attempts to produce responsible or conforming citizens.

From another angle, the growth of mass schooling produced its own problems for those seeking to transform the state from above while at the same time securing the continued subordination of the working class. Some of these were political or had political consequences, such as the tendency for the upper

layers of the working class to demand extended forms of education which threatened to rupture the carefully defined categories of schooling within which the cultural reproduction of social classes, in so far as class cultures are reproduced in schools, took place. Other problems caused by the education of the people were of a more technical nature and were connected to the provision and administration of the school system. Given that during the thirty years after 1870 the average number of pupils in attendance at elementary schools increased by some three and a half million and that the apparatus to handle this unprecedented expansion had to be created virtually overnight, it is unsurprising that the system was imperfect. However, one of the main technical difficulties flowed from what was sometimes termed, the social problem or the problem of widespread poverty. Specifically, curriculum and pedagogy, even though they were intended to take account of the class background of its recipients proved to be, as will be seen in Chapters 4 and 11, entirely unsuitable for the children of the urban poor who were drafted into the elementary schools mainly after 1880.

3.0 The Politics of Education in the Late Nineteenth Century.

The Froebel movement was shaped by and responded to these two facets of the crisis. It became deeply involved in the schools/industry debate and subsequently, in the production of educational solutions to the 'social problem'. However, the experience of the crisis did not generate a uniform set of analyses or prescriptions either in education or in other fields of social practice. Experts on education, whether internal or external, (15) were divided but before examining the nature of those divisions and the location of the Froebel movement in relation to them, it is necessary to discuss briefly

what is taken here to constitute the politics of education in the late Nineteenth Century.

In one sense, that of Parliamentary politics, to speak of a politics of education in this period is somewhat misleading. The content and administration of schooling excited little Parliamentary interest. This is evidenced by the debates on the Codes which regulated elementary schooling which were notoriously ill-attended.(16) Moreover, the fact that only one holder of the post of Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education - the *de facto* Minister of Education'- was ever made a member of the Cabinet reinforces the view that, in Parliamentary terms, schooling was low on the list of political priorities.(17)

On the otherhand, the 'religious question' which was directly concerned with the content and the control of schooling, had the capacity to move great numbers to political action. This was never seen more clearly than in 1902 when Nonconformist opposition to the Tories' Bill to put 'Rome on the rates' led to mass demonstrations and a campaign of passive resistance. (18) Unquestionably, this agitation also contributed greatly to the success of the Liberal Party, the political repository of Nonconformity, in 1906.(19) The centrality of the religious question to the politics of schooling was also apparent in the elections to the School Boards, which were for much of the country the democratically elected local authorities for elementary schooling. This was a politics of school knowledge in which an aspect of what was taught, the content of the curriculum relating to religion, was held to have a central significance Indeed it is hard to find any area of schooling which was not touched by the religious question which even cut across the divisions of class

and gender, which were during the 1880's gradually assuming a political significance and a force in education.

Nevertheless, although inextricably linked to what the Fabian, Sidney Webb disdainfully termed 'sectarian squabbles' (20) there is discernible another politics of education emerging which was organised and conducted by those who, like Webb himself, were educational experts. A major aspect of this politics was its concern to substitute the category of the Nation for the particularism of the denomination as the point of reference of all educational debate. Associated with this was a desire to depoliticize schooling and to present it as a rationalized activity amenable to technical programmes and solutions

3.1 Experts and Professionalization.

As Johnson has shown, the presence of experts on education advocating education as a solution and the state as the means was not a phenomena unique to the 1880's. (21) The intervention in the debates of the 1880's by experts such as Edwin Chadwick (1800-1890), albeit with less authority than previously, registered the existence of a generation of experts who were active in proposing educational solutions to the problems of the 1830's. However, the expansion of the system of elementary schooling which followed the Act of 1870 led to a quantitative expansion in those whose function it was to be a state, educational expert.(22) As this category is held to be an important one it is necessary to outline who is included within it. Principally, the category is used here to include all those whose legitimacy as an expert on an aspect of education was recognized by the state. That recognition took the form of employment as in the case of Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI) but it could also take the form of providing facilities such as the Special Reports series (23)

for the publication of work or it could take the form of membership of a Royal Commission or a Departmental Committee. Within this category there were, as might be expected, differences of power between those experts who promoted solutions and those who merely executed them but all were bound together by their relation to the state.

The expansion of the various systems of schooling, of which that provided for the working class had the most intimate connection with the state, gave to the practice of the experts a greater specific weight -both within the state and in civil society- as new problems engendered by the spread of schooling were confronted. The School Boards, or more specifically the urban ones, constituted one of the most important sites where experts constructed programmes and attempted their implementation. For many however, the popular democracy of the School Boards was an obstacle to the practice of expertise. One index of this is the growing demand from collectivists like Sidney Webb for the creation of arenas free from the exigencies of elections in which non-state experts could place their expertise at the service of the state.(24) Thus there were added to the Royal Commissions and the Inspectorate, the traditional sites for the practice of expertness, new ones which co-opted experts such as the Office of Special Inquiries and Reports and, in 1900, the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education. (25)

This latter body, became, almost by stealth and not long after its establishment, semi-representative. (26) However, in this it was conforming to a tendency evident in the composition of the Royal Commissions on Education of the period; namely the granting of representation to newly emergent interests such as elementary teachers, women and labour. (27) Furthermore, the move towards differentiated schooling exemplified in the establishment of schools

for the handicapped, pupil-teacher centres and organised science schools was paralleled by the construction and the subsequent dispersion into innumerable specialisms of a field of educational knowledge. Each step in the increasing division of educational labour provided the potential, at least, for the elaboration of new kinds of experts who, like the Froebelians, sought representation on bodies concerned with education.

As applied knowledge came to assume, if only on the surface, an increasing importance in the overall direction of the system of schooling so it did also with respect to the internal workings of schools. That importance was recognised by Sadler, among others, who argued that the practice of education itself needed to be 'enlightened by the scientific study of the aims and methods of teaching'. (28) This stress on professionalization was to prove beneficial to the Froebelians but it was a stress that never became translated into the achievement by teachers of professional status after the model of doctors, accountants, surveyors and others. Thus, while it is possible to detect signs of the processes of bureaucratisation and rationalization at work, their inexorable march as even Weber recognized seemed not to have occured in England.(29) The reasons why this was so have much to do with the 'peculiarities of the English', (30) the specific relation of forces in England which, in turn, is also a key to the politics of education in the late Nineteenth Century.

3.2 The Social Location of Experts.

The specificity of the English social formation may be approached through a further consideration of the position of educational experts. One question regarding experts not considered so far concerns their social location. For Perkin, Duman and Hall, experts, in the Nineteenth Century, constituted a

distinct class. (31) Nevertheless, conceptualising experts as a class, as Perkin's work illustrates, does not prevent them from being differentiated according to their attachment to rival philosophies. (32) This leaves the major problem of accounting for the social bases of these rival philosophies. If regarding experts as a class cannot account for this then the sense in which the concept of class is being deployed needs questioning.

To a large extent this problem arises from accepting the experts' view of themselves. In most instances, and in the manner of Mannheim, (33) they saw themselves as above the conflict of the main classes and as forming an independent class. But an alternative way of looking at those who have been referred to as experts, was proposed by Gramsci in his theory of the intellectuals. Briefly, in Gramsci's view, every historically emergent class creates alongside itself, intellectuals who are 'organic' to it. (34) These intellectuals perform numerous functions which, in civil society, create 'social hegemony' and in the state produce 'political government'. (35) Gramsci differentiated intellectuals according to their position in a hierarchy of activities which ranged from the creation of various sciences, philosophy and art to administration and the reproduction of 'pre-existing, traditional accumulated intellectual wealth'.(36) In contrast to the way the category of expert has been applied thus far, Gramsci's category of the intellectuals is a much broader one and one which applied to schooling would range from the lowest grade of teacher to the highest academic or administrator. While this expanded conception has its uses in considerations of the exercise of hegemony, it is not particularly useful for the present purpose which has to do mainly with those whom Gramsci referred to as the 'professional category of the intellectuals'. (37)

4.0 The Composition of the Power Bloc.

Intellectuals in this professional category were seen by Gramsci as being linked to the dominant class(es) and class fractions. These classes and class fractions, in the the sphere of political class relations, constitute the 'power bloc'. This concept , which avoids the implication of a monolithic subject present in the concept of 'the ruling class', has been defined by Poulantzas as:

> a contradictory unity of *politically dominant* classes and fractions *under the protection of the hegemonic fraction.*(38)

The question of which fraction was hegemonic within the power bloc of late Nineteenth Century England has been the subject of much debate. (39) In the view of Marx, the position was fairly clear; the 'industrial bourgeoisie' ruled 'in actual practice' whereas the 'landed aristocracy' formed 'the official government'. Within this category, Marx placed the Cabinet, Parliament, the Civil Service, the Army and the Navy and it is worth noting that he might well have included in his list the Education Department also. (40) This represented, argued Marx, a compromise, between the ascendant bourgeoisie and a 'vanishing' aristocracy. A compromise which was reached due to a fear of the working class.(41) Nevertheless, Marx predicted that the demands of the Free Traders, the representatives of the bourgeoisie, would be met. These he described as:

> the complete and undisguised ascendancy of the bourgeoisie, the open, official subjugation of society at large to the laws of modern bourgeois production, and to the rule of those men who are directors of that production. (42)

When the time arrived when these demands were realised, argued Marx, 'the mask' which had hidden, 'the real political features of Great Britain' would be torn off.

There are two major problems with Marx's analysis which have been taken up in subsequent debates. Firstly, the term 'landed aristocracy' with its connotations of feudalism was used by Marx in order to make a political point; namely the archaic nature of political rule of those referred to as the aristocracy. However, as Johnson has argued, the 'landed aristocracy' was not a feudal class but one which was based upon agrarian capitalism. (43) The fracture within the power bloc was therefore not so much one between classes rooted in different modes of production as between different fractions of capital. Secondly, and this follows from the last point, what Marx predicted, the reconstruction of the social formation in the image of the bourgeoisie, did not occur, at least not in the form in which he expected it. Instead, the appearance of the compromise of the 1830's was constantly recreated in a form which pressed the 'style' of the aristocracy into the service of 'capital in general' and this prevented the universal triumph of Gradgrindery. (44)

This, in turn, was made possible by the subordination within the power bloc of industrial capital to commercial and finance capital, a process which occurred towards the end of the Nineteenth Century and which was associated with imperialism. Evidence of this process has been provided by Rubinstein, who in an extensive study of wealth holders in the Nineteenth Century, divided the 'middle class' or bourgeiosie into, what he calls, two classses. The largest class, he argued, was based upon commercial activities and the City of London in particular, while the smaller of the two, the 'manufacturing class' was based on industry especially that of the towns in the North of England. (45)

Of these two classes, the former, according to Rubinstein, was much closer socially to traditional landed society (46) or the landed aristocracy which he sees more as a separate class than as a class fraction. (47)

On the question of the existence of a cultural division within the power bloc there is little difference between those who, like Rubinstein, speak of three classes and those like Gray who prefer to see them as class fractions. For example, in Gray's view, the landowners were:

> a highly distinctive group, whose interests were strongly articulated and whose culture and values were in important respects different from those of the urban ruling class. (48)

What is common in both approaches is the recognition that the interests of the industrial capitalists and those of the landed capitalists were opposed to each other in certain important respects.

However, towards the end of the century that opposition became less visible, although Chamberlain's championing of protectionism may be seen as an attempt to organise the industrial bourgeoisie behind a policy which was inimical to the continuation of free trade which was so beneficial to the City. Moreover, by then, land as the basis of a distinctive fraction of landed capital had lost its importance due to the collapse of land prices which was also accompanied by the transformation, charted by Thompson, of landed capital into commercial and finance capital. (49)

The effects of these shifts on the political level, the resolution of the contest for hegemony within the power bloc in favour of commercial and financial capital (50) was accompanied by the congregation of all forms of capital around the Tory party. From the middle of the 1890's, the Liberal

party, once the home of the bulk of capital, was deserted by all its major sectors: land, commerce, finance and much of industry. Of all the sectors of capital, only the owners of large factories with mainly Jewish or dissenting backgrounds continued to support the Liberal party. (51)

4.1 Class Fractions: Intellectuals and Education.

In Gramsci's view, although the land-owning class in England lost its economic power, it continued to exercise 'political-intellectual supremacy' and was 'assimilated' as traditional intellectuals, his term for the professionals of the mind who were tied to a class 'on the way to disappearing'. (52) The task of the intellectuals organic to a 'group that is developing towards dominance', according to Gramsci was to, assimilate and conquer "ideologically" the traditional intellectuals. However, he observed that in England, the traditional intellectuals were joined by 'a kind of suture' to the industrial bourgeoisie which had failed to make any substantial advances in the 'intellectual-political field'. Progress in this field was made more easy, he argued, if the bourgeoisie or any 'new group', elaborated its own intellectuals and such work, for Gramsci, was the province of schools. (53)

In Nineteenth Century England, however, the schools in which most intellectuals were formed were the public schools which, in appearance at least, were highly traditional.(54) The classical curriculum provided by these schools provided 'cultivation' and aimed at the formation of 'gentlemen'. (55) But they were not, despite appearances, run by the aristocracy but by the offspring of the lesser gentry, of professionals and the clergy. The social layer which lacking wealth, fought hardest for the retention of the classics for, as the Taunton Commission put it, they had 'nothing to look to but education to keep their sons on a high social level'. (56)

For critics of the classical curriculum, such as Herbert Spencer, this education gave, to those who received it, merely, 'a badge marking a certain social position, and [...] a consequent respect'. (57) Although by the end of the century the cult of athleticism was beginning to supplant the classics in the public schools,(58) the production of' gentlemen', whose education was untainted by anything which might be construed as specialisation or vocational, remained firmly in place as the chief objective of such schools. Nonetheless, these schools did, despite appearances, provide a form of vocational training. They were, said the Clarendon Commission,'the chief nurseries of our statesmen'. Within these schools, as the idealist philosopher, T.H.Green observed, there were educated, 'the landed gentry, the men of large inherited capital', the 'richer clergy of the privileged church and the more successful professional men'.(59) From these latter categories were drawn, as Fred Clarke argued, most of the new professionals who were to run the state; a task which, because of its increasing complexity, was beyond the ability of aristocratic amateurs. (60)

Thus in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, following the passing of the University Acts and under the direction of Jowett and Green, the emphasis changed from one which concentrated on the production of clerics to the production of organic intellectuals who were to run the state and the empire. (61) These universities produced, for example, the permanent officials of the Education Department whom before 1870 were drawn mainly from Balliol College, Oxford and Trinity College, Cambridge subsequently.(62)

4.2 Traditional Intellectuals and the Aims of Elementary Schooling.

The elementary school system, over which the Education Department presided, had a rather different educational objective than the production of gentlemen.

That objective has been described persuasively by Johnson as the establishment of an inner restraint and a behavioural order in the children of the working class. (63) In the 1860's, the Newcastle Commission quoted approvingly the Rev. James Fraser's view of the most appropriate curriculum for the elementary school. Fraser, who later became Bishop of Manchester, held that schooling beyond the age of ten or eleven was not in the real interests of the 'peasant boy' and that all such boys required was an education in the basic skills of spelling, reading, ciphering, a little geography and:

> a sufficient recollection of the truths taught him in his catechism, to know what are the duties required of him towards his maker and his fellow man. (64)

When coupled with Robert Lowe's economic liberalism, with its promise of an elementary schooling which was either cheap or efficient, such a view as that of Fraser produced and justified a very restricted notion of elementary schooling. This notion was nevertheless, different from that held earlier in the century by those who may, with some justification, be regarded as true traditional intellectuals. Then they had argued against the provision of any schooling at all for the working class on the grounds that it might render that class dissatisfied and rebellious. (65) While, by the latter part of the century, this view attracted little support within the power bloc it was one which could be appealed to by those such as George Kekewich, a permanent secretary at the Education Department who sought the provision of a liberal type of elementary schooling. In his view the Church, the Tory peers, squires and landlords could never have:

> any honest sympathy with the progress of education, which makes for liberty and equality and undermines their authority. It is not and never has been , the interest of the Church, or of its allies, the landed proprietors to make the people think.(66)

In response to criticism of this nature and Lowe's depredations, Matthew Arnold, a leading figure in the work of fitting traditional educational ideals to changed circumstances, could only offer the opinion that in the elementary schools, more Latin, poetry and religion ought to be taught. (67)

4.3 Education and Intellectuals Organic To Industrial Capital.

Within the view of those intellectuals who were closely connected to industrial capital, a corollary of Kekewich's attack on the Church, Tory, landed bloc, was that education, especially if it were based on science could lead to universal enlightenment. Quite inaccurately, for example, the prominent chemist and Liberal politician, Lyon Playfair, (1818-1898) claimed that an aristocratic society had never been and never could be favourable to the advance of science.(68) Like Arnold, the promoters of science, technical and manual instruction, also saw education as a process of cultivation but as one of Arnold's most famous antagonists on this question, T.H.Huxley (1825-1895) constantly argued, cultivation could also be attained by means of a study of science. (69)

The institutional basis for the elaboration of intellectuals organic to the industrial bourgeoisie was very narrow compared with that of those connected to landed capital. The curriculum by which many like Playfair

were formed, was developed in the dissenting academies and the proprietary schools. These latter schools were founded early in the Nineteenth Century and were said by Green to cater for the sons of members of the learned professions and for 'those commercial men who never appear behind a counter'.(70) Until the foundation of the Civic Universities, the main alternative to the classics and Anglican dominated ancient universities was University College which was established in London in 1826. Those seeking research training in science were, like Playfair, forced to go to Germany as no facilities for such work existed in England on a comparable scale.

In the pursuit of their aims, these intellectuals formed a series of organizations within the field of education such as the 'X' Club which was founded in 1864. In 1887 there was established the most important of these bodies which pressed the claim of science and technology, the National Association for the Promotion of Technical and Secondary Education (NAPTSE). (71) Members of these organizations sat on the Royal Commission on Scientific Instruction and the Advancement of Science (Devonshire Commission) and the Royal Commission on Technical Instruction (Samuelson Commission). The NAPTSE programme corresponded very closely to the Samuelson recommendations and all of the Samuelson commissioners joined NAPTSE. These intellectuals were therefore embedded within the policy forming bodies of the state educational apparatus. The division within the power bloc was further reproduced within the state apparatus of schooling by the division of control over elementary schooling between the Education Department and the Science and Art Department.

In summary, the outcomes of the campaigns of these intellectuals who were bound to industrial capital, during the last decades of the Nineteenth Century, were mixed. The Public Schools remained largely unaffected by their activities but in other secondary, mainly grammar, schools some headway was made. These schools, according to the Royal Commission on Secondary Education (Bryce Commission), were attended mainly by boys and girls who did not go to university but left school at sixteen. They were, said the Commission, the children of the 'great body of the commercial and professional classes' who had long been forced to accept a 'defective' education.(72) The schooling of this category had for some time prior to the publication of the Bryce Commission's Report been a matter of concern which had partly arisen from the need to produce more 'functionaries' to fill the places created by an expanding state. In addition, concern arose from the feeling that 'young Englishmen' were, as Bryce put it, disadvantaged, 'in industry and commerce owing to the superior preparation of their competitors in several countries of continental Europe'. (73) Another source of pressure upon the schools catering for this category was the upward extension of the elementary system in the form of the Higher Grade and Organised Science schools which, aided and abetted by the Science and Art Department, provided a science based, post-elementary education.(74) Consequently, the Bryce Commission produced a reformulation of secondary education which broke with the previously dominant practice of restricting it to the disciplining of the 'faculties' and the cultivation of the character by means of 'the more humane and generous studies'. What was novel about the Bryce version of secondary education was the concession that technical education could form a part of secondary

education. Moreover considerations of utility were included as may be seen in the following declaration that:

> secondary education, therefore, as inclusive of technical, may be described as education conducted in view of the special life that has to be lived with the express purpose of forming a person fit to live. (75)

Discursive transformations are not always followed by transformations in other spheres and not long after the Bryce Commission reported, Robert Morant, a new sort of intellectual, organic to the state, redrew the boundaries of secondary schooling in such a way that science occupied only a marginal place within it.

The NAPTSE inspired Technical Instruction Act of 1889 was a more substantial achievement but one which produced a number of unintended consequences. This Act permitted the raising of a rate by County and County Borough Councils which could be spent by technical instruction committees in support of technical instruction. This was defined by the Act as:

> instruction in the principles of science and art applicable to industries, and in the application of special branches of science and art to specific industries or employments. It shall not include teaching the practice of any trade or industry or employment...(76)

In the year following the passage of the Act, the work of the technical instruction committees was enhanced greatly by the diversion of the 'whiskey money' to support for technical instruction. However, the way in

which technical instruction was interpreted, frequently subverted the intentions of its promoters. In London, for instance, the technical instruction committee, which was there entitled the Technical Instruction Board, under the guidance of Sidney Webb, who was its chair, used the money not primarily for technical instruction but to promote secondary education generally. With the money, Webb was able to supervise the construction of his ' capacity catching ' machine; a system of scholarships which enabled elementary pupils to go to grammar schools which were badly in need of financial support.(77)

In the elementary sector, the intellectuals organic to industrial capital made their greatest advances. But while the Liberal and Nonconformist 'minority' on the Royal Commission on the Elementary Education Acts (Cross Commission) were able to convince the Anglican/Tory majority of the need to recast the elementary school curriculum in a utilitarian direction, the Tories prevented the extension of the Technical Instruction Act to the elementary schools, as NAPTSE desired, on the grounds that it would have placed intolerable financial burdens on the Church provided elementary schools.(78) On the other hand, the elementary Codes, from 1890 onwards as will be discussed in Chapter 6, show a marked turn towards the provision of skills for boys and girls which could, in theory, have enhanced the value of their labour power. Also in that Chapter consideration will be given to the relation between the Froebel movement and the intellectuals who have been identified here.

5.0 Industrial Trainers Versus Old Humanists.

The preceding, compressed, account of the politics of education up until the final years of the late Nineteenth Century has sought to argue that

many of the conflicts and debates about education during this period, including those with a religious complexion, may be best understood by relating them to conflicts within the power bloc. This approach bears some similarities to that of Williams whose work remains one of the few examples of an attempt to produce a history of the politics of educational knowledge for this period.(79) Those who have here been referred to as intellectuals organic to the industrial bourgeoisie largely correspond to that group which Williams calls 'industrial trainers'. Similarly, his category of 'old humanists' is close in content to that of, what has here been termed, the intellectuals organic to landed capital. Williams' proposed the existence of a third category, which he termed the 'public educators'. According to him, they argued that:

> men had a natural human right to be educated, and that any good society depended on governments accepting this principle as their duty.(80)

The problem with this category, and the reason why it has received so little attention here is that its representatives could easily, like T.H.Green or T.H.Huxley for example, be assimilated to one or other of the two main positions.(81) That is not to suggest that the stance, which for example is strikingly present in the work of J.S. Mill,(82) was unimportant but the evidence for it ever having attained a prolonged independent existence, is insufficient.

Furthermore, although Williams' analysis is highly suggestive his category of the 'industrial trainers' is potentially misleading as is his contention that the 'industrial trainers' 'won' the struggle with the old humanists.(83) With regard to the first point, in a subsequent

discussion of the groupings identified in The Long Revolution, Williams for the first time referred to the social bases of the arguments. He described the 'industrial trainers' as:

> the new capitalists, people who see the need for a new kind of scientific and especially technical education, who therefore want new subjects brought into the curriculum, not only scientific and technical but, for example, modern languages, to meet the needs of a new kind of trade.(84)

In its essentials, provided that it is clear that he is referring principally to secondary schooling and that it is acknowledged that capitalists very rarely took part in educational debates, this view is broadly in line with what is being argued here. However, Williams also identified another grouping as being part of the category of the 'industrial trainers'. This he described as:

> a new kind of bureaucracy, expanding very rapidly in this period of imperialist development and change in the character of the State.(85)

In the analysis of the power bloc presented above the argument was made that the industrial fraction did not 'win' as Marx had predicted it would. Consequently the state and civil society was not remade in the image and likeness of the industrial bourgeoisie. In education the industrial argument was constrained and eventually subordinated in a new settlement which was forged mainly by those whom Williams terms a bureaucracy but are here identified as intellectuals organic to the emergent state form within which the commercial and financial fractions of the power bloc were

hegemonic. If these new organic intellectuals like Morant and Sidney Webb had anything at all in common with the intellectuals active in education who were organic to the industrial bourgeoisie it was that both groupings advocated a strategy of modernization.

6.0 Modernization and Education.

The term modernization carries with it many meanings which are derived from what might be called the problematic of modernization. In many hands, this problematic leads to a teleological explanation of the transition from ideal typical 'traditional societies' to ideal typical 'modern' ones.(86) However, this tends to suggest that modernization is a universal as well as an inexorable process which unfolds in history like Hegel's Absolute. Moreover, there are no overwhelmingly irresistible grounds to subsume the deep structural transformations labelled industrialization and urbanization, the symptoms of which began to manifest themselves in the Nineteenth Century, under the heading of modernization. One result of the operation of these processes may have been structural differentiation but modernization theories are weak in explaining how that occurred. (87) These processes occurred and continue to occur and while the pace of change in industrial organization accelerates during certain periods due to the transformation of the instruments of production, there are no grounds for assuming that the process is not a continuous one nor for assuming that what is modern is not constantly being rendered out of date. Hence, modernization, in this sense, never occurs but is always in the process of becoming. In the same way as what is modern is not a finished state but an unstable one which is subject to constant transformation, Williams demonstrates in The

Country and the City, that, that which is regarded as 'traditional' is also liable to be an illusion which is subject to constant regression.

An alternative way of looking at modernization is suggested by Gramsci's comment on the educative and formative role of the state. The state's aim, he wrote:

> is always that of creating new and higher types of civilisation; of adapting the "civilisation" and the morality of the broadest popular masses to the necessities of the continuous development of the economic apparatus of production.(88)

Taken together with his analysis of 'Americanism and Fordism',(89) Gramsci's insight permits an understanding of modernization as a continuous process but one which has different objectives at different periods and one which is led by historical agents who differ according to the conjuncture. Thus, as long as industrial competition was paramount the conditions were present for the intellectuals organic to the industrial bourgeoisie to launch a struggle against blockages and obstructions of a political and social kind which stood in the way of transforming the forces of production. With regard to education, this led to attacks upon the ideas and practices of those whom Williams calls the old humanists. Put in this context, the frequent criticisms of the elementary schools made by intellectuals organic to industrial capital for producing clerks and not skilled workers becomes more easily understood. Once however, the balance of forces within the power bloc began to alter and imperial interests came to the fore, a new wave of modernization began sparked off

paradoxically by the Church and the Tories who feared the effects of modernizing measures introduced by the Liberals and thus preempted them. This modernization focussed less on school knowledge and more upon the machinery of schooling and its administration. In this period, which began in the 1890's, the call for the elaboration of skilled labour and experts in the techniques of production was still present but it was increasingly submerged by demands for other experts such as 'the thinkers and administrators' advocated by the Fabian, Graham Wallas (90) or to fill other 'callings' like those which were listed by Sadler as the:

> professional, commercial, [...] adventurous, military, administrative, directive, legislative, official [and] social....(91)

In educational terms these demands became translated into pressure for a general secondary education, provided by the state for those who could afford it and for those 'fitted' to benefit from it. The old humanism had to be changed but in such a way that much of it was conserved.(92) This pressure led to the defeat of that part of the state educational apparatus which waged an internal battle on behalf of industry, the Science and Art Department (93) and it also saw the position of the Public Schools secured in a position of dominance over the state secondary schools so that they led those state schools culturally but were not themselves of the state.(94)

With respect to elementary schooling, the Board of Education under Morant's direction played down the elementary schools' role in reproducing skills and instead emphasised moral and physical fitness. Sadler described this new turn as one which recognized:

> the importance of making the schools prepare the children for citizenship; and for individual efficiency in this or that type of future calling; and upon the need of dovetailing educational discipline into the practical tasks of life.(95)

Eaglesham, perhaps more accurately, has called this new emphasis a 'training in followership'.(96)

This period from the mid 1890's to the early 1900's was then a period in which a new settlement in education was constructed. Instead of having as its chief object the production of male industrial workers and female domestic labourers, elementary schooling in this period focussed on the production of soldiers for the Empire and mothers of the Imperial race. The settlement also established another function for elementary schooling which was the selection of those regarded as fit to benefit from a secondary schooling and perform the tasks of functionaries. The legislative monuments of this settlement are well known and include the Board of Education Act of 1899 and the Education Act of 1902. In administrative terms, Morant's period at the Board of Education was also crucial to the settlement which contained both the industrial argument and pressure for working class access to post elementary schooling. Writing in 1906, Sadler, whose *leit-motiv* was the 'two mindedness of English education spoke of the trend towards 'social fusion' in education.(97)

Others saw it differently and they included H.G.Wells, a product of the South Kensington School of Science and an indefatigable propagandist for a modernized, scientific education. Wells saw everywhere the resistance of 'the established religions, the ruling aristocracies and whatever remained

of the 'scholarly' medieval universities' to what he called 'the new educational organizations essential to the proper working of the new order'.(98)

7.0 Collectivism and Education.

Much of what has been discussed as indicative of strategies of modernization necessitated action to enhance the role of the state in education. Such strategies may broadly be termed, collectivist.(99) In terms of the forces within the power bloc and the strategies pursued by intellectuals in education, the impetus for collectivism came mainly from the side of industry but there were notable exceptions such as Spencer who, although he advocated the teaching of science, was a libertarian and Huxley who was also suspicious of an enhanced role for the state.(100) On the other side, Arnold was a prominent advocate of increased state provision and regulation of education as was Sadler who, in 1902, argued that:

> The State is compelled, practically as well as morally, to care for its schools. It cannot evade the obligation. Economic reasons alone and considerations of social order compel the State to act. (101)

Sadler, however, in this period had close links not only with collectivists on the Liberal Imperialist side but also with the Fabians and his observations often are framed within the language of National Efficiency, the movement which cross cut political boundaries and which was centred upon the twin themes of Nation and Empire.(102)

Sadler's position and that of Arnold before him illustrate the contradictions within the collectivist position. For them, collectivism was

seen as a means to harness the pressure for modernization and to conserve much that was thought of as traditional within education. But at the same time as Sadler and Morant fought to ensure the continued dominance of the classics and liberal education their collectivist ally, Sidney Webb, looked to the state to train professionals in new universities which would, in his description, be 'technical schools'.(103) There was, then, no simple equation between collectivism and modernization. Modernizers were forced to become collectivists for only the state could provide and organize the necessary schools and equipment and, as the Church elementary schools showed, only the state could maintain them. But not all collectivists were enthusiastic modernizers in the sense that the term has been used here.

8.0 Conclusion.

The framework and the concepts outlined in this Chapter will be drawn upon throughout the rest of this study to illuminate aspects of the history of the Froebel movement as well as the history of elementary schooling up to 1914. Neither can be seen adequately without an appreciation of the struggle to transform the state during the period and the recomposition of the boundary between the public and the private which this entailed. In this, recomposition schooling was centrally involved; hence the struggles over its form and its content. The transformation of the state so that, as Sadler wrote in the first issue of the Times Educational Supplement in 1910, it had a greater responsibility 'for the upbringing of its future citizens',(104) also brought with it a greater emphasis on the knowledge required to run its programmes and on the production of experts to apply that knowledge. The emergence of a

rationalized discourse on education which accompanied the state provision of mass schooling from the 1880' onwards had the effect of displacing the religious question and the traditional view of schooling, if not within the field of popular politics, then within the field designated by the pedagogic community.

With regard to ideologies about curriculum and pedagogy, however, what has been proposed is that the 'pedagogic community' was more open to political conflicts than is sometimes allowed. It is not, nor was it, hermetically sealed from the interplay of social forces and pedagogy is not solely a neutral, technical activity free from connection with other debates and conflicts. This does not mean, however, that what occurs in the pedagogic community should always be seen as reactive. Strategies of modernization, for example, provided the conditions for factions within the Froebel movement to launch their own internally generated initiatives in an opportunistic way and to try to attach them to the projects of the modernizers. Specifically, it will be demonstrated in the following chapters that the Froebel movement was associated with the wave of modernization led by those arguing for scientific, technical and manual training. It will also be shown that, in a much altered form and at a later period, the Froebelian pedagogy was made to serve the new settlement which has been identified with Morant and the repertoires of collectivism and national efficiency. In the following Chapter some of these linkages will be further examined through a consideration of the social and political composition of the Froebel movement.

Chapter 2

FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES.

1). This was implied quite strongly in Sutherland, G. (1973) Policy-Making in Elementary Education 1870-1895. Oxford, Oxford University Press. especially pp. 343-344. Although she granted that George Kekewich, a Permanent Secretary to the Education Department, shaped policy. See also: Sutherland, G. (1970) 'Recent Trends in Administrative History'. Victorian Studies. Vol. XIII. No. 4. pp. 408-411. Lewis Amherst Selby-Bigge, another Permanent Secretary (at the Board of Education) observed that in the education service the line between policy and administration was 'very indistinct'. Selby-Bigge, L. A. (1934) (2nd ed) The Board of Education. London, Putnam. p. 71.

2). For the argument that the experts led the politicians see: Hay, J. R. (1983) The Origins of the Liberal Welfare Reforms 1906-1914. London, MacMillan. p. 22.

3). See: Hall, S. and Schwarz, B. (1985) 'State and Society, 1880-1930', in Langan, M. and Schwarz, B. (eds.) Crises in the British State 1880-1930. London, Hutchinson. pp. 8-16. and Hall (1984) op. cit. pp. 30-34.

4). Johnson, R.(1979) 'Culture and the Historians' in Clarke, J., Critcher, C. and Johnson, R. (eds) Working Class Culture. London, Hutchinson. p.43.

5). For a review of contemporary perceptions see: Roderick, G. W. and Stephens, M. D. (1978) Education and Industry in the Nineteenth Century. London, Longman. pp. 156-160. and for a discussion of specific industries see: Roderick, G. W. and Stephens, M. D. (1981) Where Did We Go Wrong? Falmer, Falmer Press.

6). Quoted in Maclure, J. S. (1973) Educational Documents England and Wales: 1816 to the Present Day. London, Methuen. p.104.

7). See: Hobsbawm, E. J. (1969) Industry and Empire. Harmondsworth, Penguin. pp. 172-194. Gamble, A. (1981) Britain in Decline. London, MacMillan. pp. 52-58.

8). See: Armytage, W. H. G. (1969a) The German Influence on English Education. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. pp. 62-64. Hobsbawm. op. cit. pp. 180-181.

9). Selleck. (1972) op. cit. p.85.

10). Sadler, M. E. (1902b) 'A Contrast Between German and American Ideals in Education' in Board of Education' in Board of Education. Special Reports on Educational Subjects. Vol. 11. London, HMSO. p. 458.

11). See: Mitchell, B. R. and Deane, P. (1962) Abstract of British Historical Statistics. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. p. 60. For an account of the phenomenon and its social significance see: Crossick, G. (1977) 'The Emergence of the Lower Middle Class in Britain: A Discussion' in Crossick, G. (ed) The Lower Middle Class in Britain 1870-1914. London, Croom Helm. pp. 11-60.

12). Hobsbawm, E. op. cit. p. 191

13). ibid. pp. 191-192 and p. 244

14). For the imperialist content of school texts see: Chancellor, V. E. (1970) History for Their Masters. Bath, Adams and Dart. pp. 112-138.

15). For a Nineteenth Century use of this distinction see: Macan, H. (1901) 'Educational Experts and the Local Authority'. Journal of Education. Vol. XXIII. April. pp. 243-244.

16). See: Kekewich, G. W. (1920) The Education Department and After. London, Constable. pp.59-60.

17). This was Arthur Herbert Dyke Acland (1847-1926) who was described by Sutherland as 'one of the most committed social reformers to hold office'. Sutherland, G. (1971) Elementary Education in the Nineteenth Century. London, The Historical Association. p. 43. and Sutherland op. cit. p. 313. See also: Bellamy, J. M. and Saville, J. (eds) (1972) Dictionary of Labour Biography. Vol. 1. London, Macmillan. pp. 6-8. Gordon and White. op. cit. pp. 93-98 and pp. 134-146. Holmes, G. M. (1964) 'The Parliamentary and Ministerial Career of A.H.D. Acland 1886-97'. The Durham Research Review. Vol. IV, No.15. pp. 128-139 and the disappointing, Acland, A. (1981) A Devon Family. Chichester, Philimore which adds little to what has already been published about Arthur Acland.

18). For the passive resistance see: Eaglesham, E. (1962) 'Implementing the Education Act of 1902'. British Journal of Educational Studies. Vol. X. No. 2. pp. 153-175.

19). See: Simon, B. (1965) Education and the Labour Movement 1870-1920. London, Lawrence and Wishart. pp. 208-235. Pelling, H. (1979) Popular Politics and Society in Late Victorian Britain. London, Macmillan. p.9. and Glaser, J. F. (1972) 'Decline of Nonconformist Conscience' in Schlutz, H. J. (ed.) English Liberalism and the State. Lexington, Mass. D.C. Heath. p. 50.

20). Webb, S. (1973a) 'The Education Muddle and the Way Out'. Fabian Tract No.106. 1901. in Van Der Eyken, W. (ed.) Education, the Child and Society. Harmondsworth, Penguin. p. 62.

21). Johnson, R. (1977) 'Educating the Educators: 'Experts' and the State 1833-9' in Donajgrodzki, A.P. Social Control in Nineteenth Century Britain. London, Croom Helm. pp. 77-107.

22). For example, there were 98 of Her Majesty's Inspectors inspecting elementary schools and training colleges in 1870; a decade later there were 245. Board of Education (1924) Report of the Board of Education for the Year 1922-23. London, HMSO. p. 45. Between 1881 and 1911 the number of men in professional occupations increased by 93.8% and in public administration by 149%. Source: Mitchell and Deane. op. cit. p. 60.

23). In addition to providing a platform for expert figures like Morant and Sadler, the series publicised examples of 'good practice' written by prominent or expert teachers. See for example: Sharples, G. (1898) 'The Organization of Games out of School for the Children attending Public Elementary Schools'. Education Department. Special Reports on Educational Subjects. London, HMSO. pp. 159-184. Sharples was head of Waterloo Road Higher Grade School, Manchester and an NUT activist. See: PRO ED21 9727 for an HMI report critical of his union activities.

24). The argument is developed in Brehony, K. J. (1985) 'Popular Control or Control by Experts? Schooling Between 1880 and 1902' in Langan, M. and Schwarz, B. (eds.) Crises in the British State 1880-1930. London, Hutchinson. pp. 256-273.

25). For the origins of the Office of Special Inquiries and Reports see: Wilkinson, M. J. (1979) 'The Office of Special Inquiries and Reports: Educational Policy-Making under Michael Sadler'. History of Education, Vol.8. No. 4. pp. 275-291. For the Consultative Committee see: PRO ED24

1224. 'Memorandum by Mr R. F. Young On the History of the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education for England and Wales'.

26). See: PRO ED24/197 and PRO ED24/209.

27). Thus elementary school teachers were represented for the first time on the Royal Commission on the Working of the Elementary Education Acts (the Cross Commission) by T. E. Heller and women on the Royal Commission on Secondary Education (the Bryce Commission) by Lady Frederick Cavendish, Dr. Sophie Bryant and Eleanor M. Sidgwick. Labour was 'represented' on this Royal Commission by Charles Fenwick, a former miner and Liberal M.P. who was Secretary to the Parliamentary Committee of the TUC in 1890. For a discussion of the significance of the composition of the Bryce Commission see: 'Occasional Notes', Journal of Education, Vol. XVI. April, 1894. pp. 195-196.

28) Sadler, M. E. (1902a) op. cit. p. 11.

29). At least not to the same extent as in the rest of Western Europe. Gerth and Mills op. cit. pp. 210-211 and p. 214.

30). Thompson, E. P. (1978) 'The Peculiarities of the English' in Thompson, E. P. The Poverty of Theory. London, Merlin. pp. 35-91.

31). Perkin, H. (1969) The Origins of Modern English Society 1780-1880. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. On p. 252 he speaks of a 'non-capitalist or professional middle class'. Duman, D. (1979) 'The Creation and Diffusion of a Professional Ideology in Nineteenth Century England'. Sociological Review. Vol. 27. No.1. pp. 113-114. Hall, J. A. (1979) 'The Curious Case of the English Intelligentsia'. British Journal of Sociology. Vol. 30. No. 3. pp. 291-292. See also: Annan, N. G. (1955)

'The Intellectual Aristocracy' in Plumb, J. H. (ed) Studies in Social History. London, Longmans Green. pp. 243-287.

32). Perkin. op. cit. pp. 261-266.

33). See: Mannheim, K. (1972) Ideology and Utopia. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. pp. 139-144.

34). Gramsci. op. cit. pp. 5-6.

35). ibid. p. 12.

36). ibid. p. 13.

37). ibid. p. 9.

38). Poulantzas, N. (1973) Political Power and Social Classes. London, NLB. p. 239.

39). The literature on this question is extensive but the two central texts in the debate are Anderson, P. (1965) 'Origins of the Present Crisis' in Anderson, P. and Blackburn, R. (eds) Towards Socialism. London, Fontana. pp. 11-52 and Thompson, E. P. (1978) op. cit. pp. 35-91.

40). Marx, K. (1973a) 'The British Constitution' in Fernbach, D. (ed) Surveys From Exile. Harmondsworth, Penguin. p. 282. For the composition of the Education Department between 1870 and 1888 see: Sutherland, G. (1973) op. cit. pp. 13-80 and Leese, J. (1950) Personalities and Power in English Education. London, E. J. Arnold. Kekewich in Liberal fashion called the staff of the Education Department an 'aristocratic caste' and an 'aristocratic bureaucracy'. Kekewich. op. cit. p. 151 and p. 152.

41). Marx, K. (1973b) 'The Chartists' in Fernbach, D. (ed) Surveys From Exile. Harmondsworth, Penguin. pp. 263-264.

42). ibid. p. 262.

43). Johnson, R. (1980) 'Barrington Moore, Perry Anderson and English social development' in Hall, S., Hobson, D., Lowe, A. and Willis, P. (eds) Culture, Media, Language. London, Hutchinson. pp. 65-66.

44). On 'aristocratic style' see: Thompson, E. P. op. cit. p. 52 and Warwick, P. (1985) 'Did Britain Change? An Inquiry into the Causes of National Decline', Journal of Contemporary History, Vol. 20, No.1. pp. 122-124.

45). Rubinstein, W. D. (1977) 'The Victorian Middle Classes: Wealth, Occupation, and Geography'. The Economic History Review Vol. 30, No. 4. pp. 602-623. Rubinstein, W. D. (1977) 'Wealth, Elites and the Class Structure of Modern Britain' in Past and Present. No. 76. pp. 99-126.

46). ibid. pp. 112-115.

47). Rubinstein, W. D. (1981b) 'New Men of Wealth and the Purchase of Land in Nineteenth-Century Britain'. Past and Present. No.92. p.146. See also: Rubinstein, W. D. (1981a) Men of Property. London, Croom Helm. p.219.

48). Gray, R. (1977) 'Bourgeois Hegemony in Victorian Britain' in Bloomfield, J. (ed). Papers on Class, Hegemony and Party. London, Lawrence and Wishart. p. 75.

49). Thompson, F. M. L. (1963) English Landed Society in the Nineteenth Century. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

50) See: Hobsbawm, E. op. cit. pp.191-192. Gamble, A. (1981) Britain in Decline. London, Macmillan. pp.56-57.

51). Rubinstein, W. D. (1981a) p. 167. See also Engels to Bebel July 24, 1885. Cited in Torr (ed) op. cit. p.4 23.

52). Gramsci. op. cit. p.10.

53). ibid.

54). See: Honey, J. R. de S. (1977) Tom Brown's Universe. London, Millington. and Wiener, M. J. (1982) English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit 1850-1980. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

55). On the struggle between the cultivated man and specialists in education see: ibid. pp. 26-27. and Gerth and Mills. op. cit. pp. 243-244. On this, as on a number of other questions, the thought of Gramsci and Weber is similar

56). Quoted in Maclure. op. cit. p. 93.

57). Spencer. op. cit. p. 2.

58). Mangan, J. A. (1981) Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

59). Green, T. H. (1980) 'The New Oxford High School' in Reeder, D. A. (ed.) Educating Our Masters. Leicester, Leicester University Press. p. 153. The speech was made in 1882.

60). Clarke. op. cit. p. 24. Rothblatt, S. (1968) The Revolution of the Dons. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. Jenks, C. (1977) 'T. H. Green, the Oxford Philosophy of Duty and the English Middle Class'. British Journal of Sociology. Vol. 28. No. 4. pp. 481-497. Simon, B. (1974) The Two Nations and the Educational Structure 1780-1870. London, Lawrence and Wishart . pp. 290-299.

61). Gordon and White op. cit.

62). Sutherland. (1973) op. cit. p. 36.

63). Johnson, R. (1976) 'Notes on the Schooling of the English working Class 1780-1850' in Dale, R. Esland, G. and Macdonald, M. (eds) Schooling and Capitalism. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. p. 48.

64). Quoted in Maclure. op. cit. p. 75.

65). An argument made in the speech of Davies Giddy in opposition to the second reading of Whitbread's Education Bill of 1807. See: Simon. (1974) op. cit. p. 132. Also Silver, P. and Silver, H. (1974) The Education of the Poor. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. pp. 4-5.

66). Kekewich. op. cit. p. 111.

67). See Marvin, F. S. (ed.) (1908) Reports on Elementary Schools.1852-1882 by Mathew Arnold. London, HMSO. pp. 147-148.

68). Cited in Cardwell, D. S. L. (1980) The Organization of Science in England. London, Heinemann. p. 8.

69). As in his lecture 'Science and Culture' cited by Kimball, B. A. (1985) 'Mathew Arnold, Thomas Huxley, and Liberal Education: A Centennial Retrospective'. Teachers College Record. Vol. 86. No. 3. p. 477.

70). Green, T. H. op. cit. p.153.

71). For the 'X' Club see: Cardwell. op. cit. pp. 106-107. For NAPTSE see: Brehony. op. cit. pp. 259-260.

72). Quoted in Maclure. op. cit. p. 148. This was also the area identified by the Samuelson Commission as possessing 'the greatest defect'. ibid. p. 125.

73). ibid. p.148.

74). For an account of the development of these schools see: Abney, W. de W. (1903) Presidential Address, Section L, Educational Science. Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science 1903. pp. 865-875. and PP. 1895. XLIII. Royal Commission on Secondary Education. Vol. 1. pp. 52-54.

75). ibid. p. 136

76). Quoted in Board of Education (1938) Report of the Consultative Committee on Secondary Education with Special Reference to Grammar Schools and Technical High Schools. London, HMSO. p. 54.

77). The phrase 'capacity catching' is quoted by Brennan, E. J. T. (1960) 'Sidney Webb and the London TEB'. Vocational Aspects of Secondary and Further Education. Vol. XII, No. 24. p. 30. See also: Brennan, E. J. T. (1972) 'Educational Engineering with the Webbs'. History of Education. Vol. 1, No. 2. pp. 174-199. and Sharp, P. R. (1974) 'The Origin and Early Development of Local Education Authority Scholarships'. History of Education. Vol.3, No.1. pp. 36-50.

78). McCann, W. P. (1960) 'Trade Unionist, Co-operative and Socialist Organizations in Relation to Popular Education, 1870-1902'. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis University of Manchester.

79). Williams.(1965) op.cit. pp. 145-176.

80). ibid. p. 162

81). For Green's position see: Gordon and White. op.cit. p. 46 and for Huxley see: Bibby, C. (1972) Scientist Extraordinary The Life and Scientific Work of Thomas Henry Huxley 1825-1895. Oxford, Pergamon.

82). See: Mill, J. S.(1910) Utilitarianism: Liberty: Representative Government. London, J. M. Dent. pp. 160-161.

83). Williams.(1965) op.cit. p. 164.

84). Williams, R. (1978) 'Education and Social Democracy'. Unpublished paper presented to a conference of the Socialist Teachers' Alliance, London.

85). ibid.

86). This is the sense which pervades Shipman, M. D. (1971) Education and Modernisation. London, Faber and Faber. For an all-embracing use of the

concept see: Heller, A. (1984) 'Marx and Modernity'.Thesis Eleven. No.8. pp. 44-58.

87). See: Mouzelis, N. (1980) 'Modernization, Underdevelopment, Uneven Development: Prospects for a Theory of Third World Formations'. Journal of Peasant Studies. Vol. 7, No. 3. pp. 353-374.

88). Gramsci. op. cit. p. 242.

89). ibid. pp. 277-318.

90). Wallas, G. (1894) 'The Training of the Young in Their Duty to the State'. Journal of Education. Vol. XVI. May. pp. 301-303. The argument that the shift in emphasis away from technical training was related to the development of Britain as an imperial financial and commercial centre appeared in: Simon, B. (1977) 'The 1902 Education Act - A Wrong Turning'. History of Education Society Bulletin. No. 19. p. 9.

91). Sadler, M. E. (1979b) 'Secondary Education in its Bearings on Practical Life'. in Higginson, J. H. (ed). Selections From Michael Sadler. Liverpool, Dejall and Meyorre. p. 33.

92). Sadler. (1902a) op. cit. pp. 22-23

93). For an account see: Gosden, P. H. J. H. (1966) The Development of Educational Administration in England and Wales. Oxford, Basil Blackwell. pp. 90-98.

94). Sadler. (1902a) op. cit. pp. 6-7. On how this was achieved see: Wilkinson. op. cit. pp. 282-284. Also Steedman, H. (1969) 'Michael Sadler and the Campaign for an Educational Council, 1893-1903'. Research in Education Vol. 2. Nov. pp. 76-87. Lowe, R. (1976) 'The Divided Curriculum: Sadler, Morant and the English Secondary School'. Journal of Curriculum Studies. Vol. 8, No. 2. pp. 139-148.

95). Sadler, M.E. (1906) Presidential Address, Section L, Educational Science. Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science 1906. p. 766.

96). Eaglesham, E. (1967) The Foundations of Twentieth-Century Education in England. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. p. 53.

97). Sadler, M. E. (1979c) 'The Two-Mindedness of English Education' in Higginson, J. H. (ed). Selections From Michael Sadler. Liverpool, Dejall and Meyorre. pp. 187-189.

98). Wells, H. G. (1934) Experiment in Autobiography. Vol. 1. London, Gollancz and Cresset. p. 208. For Wells' views on education see: Doughty, F. H. (1926) H.G. Wells Educationist. London, Jonathan Cape.

99).. According to Perkin, the term 'collectivist' was used in seven different ways in the nineteenth century. See: Perkin, H. (1977) 'Individualism Versus Collectivism in Nineteenth Century Britain: A False Antithesis'.The Journal of British Studies. Vol. XVII. No. 1. pp. 114-116. For a discussion see: Hall and Schwartz. op. cit. pp. 16-24.

100). See: Barker, E. (1915) Political Thought from Spencer to Today. London, Williams and Norgate. pp. 138-141.

101). Sadler (1902) op. cit. p. 17.

102). For the definition of national efficiency formulated by Lord Rosebery, one of its leading advocates, see: Semmel, B. (1960) Imperialism and Social Reform. London, Allen and Unwin. p. 63. For an account of the national efficiency movement see: Searle, G. R. (1971) The Quest for National Efficiency. Oxford, Blackwell and for an overview of the relation between education and national efficiency see: Simpson, L. (1984) 'Imperialism, National Efficiency and Education, 1900-

1905'.Journal of Educational Administration and History. Vol.XVI. No.1. pp. 29-36.

103). Sadler made his strategy clear in his letter to the Oxford Hebdomadal Council April 4th 1893 in Higginson. op. cit. pp. 23-28. Webb, S.(1973b) 'The Making of a University' in Van der Eyken, W. (ed.) Education, the Child and Society. Harmondsworth, Penguin. op. cit. p.107.

104). 'The Educational Outlook'. The Times Educational Supplement. No. 1, Sept. 6th. (1910) The style is unmistakeably that of Sadler.

Chapter 3

THE SOCIAL COMPOSITION AND CHARACTER OF THE FROEBEL MOVEMENT.

1.0 Introduction.

In this Chapter the form and the social composition of the Froebel movement will be considered. The approach to be adopted is rather ahistorical as it takes the Froebel movement throughout the whole period under discussion as its object. The purpose of the chapter is to provide a sociological sketch of the movement which will reveal its most significant social characteristics. Inevitably, this procedure tends to suppress the dimension of change over time but the social characteristics of the Froebel movement are to be referred to throughout the study and any relevant changes in its social composition will be discussed. Thus, in this chapter what will be presented is a general position regarding the interests expressed by the Froebel movement and the social forces linked with it.

The centrality of religion in Froebel's work has already been referred to in chapter 1 and as the number of groupings, formed around a particular pedagogic system, multiplied towards the end of the Nineteenth Century, they were sometimes referred to, in analogies which drew upon religious social forms, as 'schools' or 'sects'.(1) As a consequence, the first aim of this chapter is to determine what, if any, significance this kind of categorisation may have for an understanding of the Froebel movement and similar movements in education. The discussion will commence with the presentation of an analysis of social formations which is derived from the

work of Raymond Williams. This will be followed by a different kind of analysis of such movements. Drawing upon perspectives which have been developed in the sociology of religion, and to a lesser extent in the study of political movements, the Froebel movement will be examined in order to discover to what extent it conformed to the concept of a sect. The main question to be addressed in this section, then, is that of, the relation between the form of the Froebel movement and its content.

The second aim of this Chapter is to reveal and account for the social composition of the Froebel movement and to map the links between it and the groupings and ideologies discussed in the previous chapter. Most theories of ideology contain some reference to the link between ideas and social interests. Thus the purpose of discussing the social composition of the Froebel movement is to unmask the social interests which the Froebelian ideology may have concealed. This is not an easy task. As will be made clear, the Froebel movement was composed overwhelmingly of women and while that fact makes the task of identifying interests somewhat less complicated than may otherwise have been the case, the records of the lives of such women, even those who were prominent in the movement, are less complete than if the movement had been composed entirely of men. Thus much has, of necessity, to be inferred from those whose lives left behind written traces.

2.0 Educational Movements as Formations.

One possible approach to the analysis of the Froebel and similar educational movements is provided by Williams in his book entitled Culture.(2) Williams suggests that the cultural formations that he is interested in may best be analysed by taking into account two factors. The

first of these is that of the internal organisation of a particular grouping or 'formation' and the other is that described by Williams as the:

> *proposed and actual relations to other organisations* in the same field and to society more generally.(3)

With respect to the internal organization of a movement or 'formation', Williams proposes a typology which ranges from those based on formal membership to those which consist of a conscious association or group identification.(4) While the Froebel movement, considered broadly, spanned this spectrum, the Froebel Society at its core approximated more to formations based on formal membership which possess in Williams' view, 'varying modes of authority or decision, and of constitution and election'.(5) Before turning to consider Williams second factor: a formation's external relations, it is necessary to consider two other ways of categorising the internal organization of formations which were applied to the Froebel movement.(6) One of these was to describe it as a 'school'. This is not very satisfactory as it is merely descriptive of a movement composed of the 'pupils' of a 'master'. Moreover, its use tends to suggest continuity when a more accurate assessment is one which seeks breaks and transformations which are triggered by external forces and events such as were discussed in the previous Chapter. The second categorization, that of a sect, deserves more consideration as it offers the possibility of greater explanatory power than the notion of a 'school'.

2.0 The Froebel Movement as a Sect.

Given the historical filiation of churches and schools, the fact that the concept of a sect is most frequently used in the sociology of religion is

not altogether inappropriate. One of the earliest theorists to investigate the phenomena of religious sects was Weber (7) but another sociological tradition in which sects have been theorized was founded by Marx and Engels who used the term in relation to political groupings.(8) Not surprisingly, given these contrasting theoretical traditions, the meanings attached to the concept of a sect tend to vary considerably. An extensive discussion of these meanings is beyond the scope of this study consequently the working definition provided by O'Toole in his study of Far Left groups in Canada will be adapted and utilised as a basis for analysis.(9) One of the virtues of O'Toole's approach is that his definition is a composite which draws together some of the common themes which he perceived during the course of a survey of uses of the concept. For O'Toole, a political sect is a:

> small distinct, exclusive political group in conflict with the wider society and composed of men and women who entering its ranks on a voluntary basis, have been selectively chosen as guardians or carriers of some specific variant of political truth.(10)

If the term educational is substituted for political some parts of this definition may be seen to apply to the Froebel movement. First of all it was very small. In 1914, when the movement was at its height, the Froebel Society could claim a membership of about 3,000.(11) Its periphery was probably much larger but in that year there were 166,000 full time teachers in England and Wales of whom 123,535 were women teachers. The Froebel movement was distinct but not especially exclusive. Membership of the Froebel Society, which was founded in 1874, was voluntary but ninety

per cent of its members in 1915 were teachers. (12) In several respects the Froebel movement was opposed to extant pedagogic practices and its leaders, at least, regarded themselves as bearers of a pedagogic truth which, if adopted, would transform not only schooling but society also.

In this context, the Froebelian stress on the importance of training is significant.(13) This had several aspects but two are of relevance to the characterisation of the Froebel movement as a sect. Firstly, training in the Kindergarten System was mainly available in private kindergartens. This had the effect of excluding all but those who could afford the training and thus bestowed on the movement a social exclusivity. Secondly, training was spoken of in terms little different from the elevation of the elect or the transmission of grace through the laying on of hands.(14) At stake, in the process of training, was the protection of the purity of the message despite its frequent reconstruction. Thus, within the Froebelian literature, such formal positions within the movement as existed, such as the post of President of the Froebel Society or the Superintendent of the older kindergartens, were handed on in a kind of apostolic succession which was traceable back to Froebel or his immediate circle. Furthermore, the selection of appropriate holders of these positions was, until the end of the Nineteenth Century, endogamous which reinforced sect-like tendencies within the movement.

Another aspect of the movement which approximates to the characteristics of a sect was the development of ways in which to live a Froebelian culture. The branch activities and the annual meeting are unremarkable ways but Froebelians were also encouraged to join the Kindergarten

Athletic Association and take holidays at Eisenach, the site of the Froebel museum.(15)

The tendency to splits and fusions, which in one instance led to the appearance of another journal, is also characteristic of political and religious sects. These splits led to the formation of what will be termed factions which were fairly loose groupings which cohered around alternative readings of the Froebelian canon to that held by the leaders of the movement. Like the Trotskyist movement discussed by O'Toole, some of these factions were formed internationally and reflected developments in the United States or Germany rather than in England.(16) These factions operated, in contrast to those in most sects, in a fairly open and pluralistic manner. The leadership controlled the movement through its control over the apparatus of certification which issued licences, as it were, which guaranteed the authenticity of their recipients Froebelian credentials and not through purges and proscriptions. If internal polemics were relatively mild, those directed to other educational formations such as the Herbartians and the Montessorians were often quite harsh.(17)

Despite these sect-like appearances, in one major respect the Froebel movement did not conform to the model of a sect. Political sects generally either become transformed into parties or operate in relation to parties. A similar relation pertains between religious sects and denominations but the Froebel movement had no such external point of reference as it was not until 1921, when the New Education Fellowship was founded, that anything resembling a pedagogic party emerged.(18) Thus as far as current discussions of sects are concerned, the Froebel movement

does not fully qualify as one, although some of its features may be best understood in terms of the concept of a sect.

2.1 External Relations

A formation's external relations are classified by Williams into three types: specializing, alternative and oppositional.(19) These categories are applied by Williams to formations which are involved in cultural production, mainly in the field of art, but may equally well be applicable to movements within education. Thus, the Froebel movement may be seen to have had characteristics typical of 'alternative' formations in the field of painting. Such formations provided, according to Williams, alternatives for the production, exhibition or publication of certain kinds of work where it was believed that existing institutions excluded them or tended to exclude them. As will be shown, the kindergarten was excluded or tended to be excluded from the elementary schools. As a result, for much of the Froebel movement's early history only the private kindergarten provided the opportunities for the practice of an alternative pedagogy. Nevertheless, the Froebel movement also displayed features characteristic of Williams' 'oppositional' formations. Such formations are said by him to be 'raised to active opposition to the established institutions, or more generally to the conditions within which these exist'.(20) In attempting to situate the Froebel movement in this manner, the question of whether or not it, or similar movements which developed subsequently, might be regarded as oppositional is one of some importance because such movements promote the view that schools can be the means of transforming the social formation and on that basis have tended to be regarded by many both on the Left and on the Right as either allies or opponents.

Whichever of these two categories, alternative or oppositional, is chosen the question of whether the Froebel movement's external relations can be regarded as oppositional or alternative is not one which can be answered without more evidence or as Williams argued, without 'extending description and analysis into general history'. (21) That task was begun in the previous Chapter but what needs to be known at this point is more about the Froebel movement's internal composition and more about its relations with other social and political forces.

3.0 The Social Composition of the Froebel Movement.

The most significant fact about the social composition of the Froebel movement was that it consisted almost entirely of women. Whatever the many problems of allocating women to a class position (22) it is, nevertheless, possible to state unequivocally that in no sense were these women, working class. Furthermore, it is not without significance that many of the women who supported the Froebel movement were single. As far as any other significant patterns are observable, the supporters of the Froebel movement tended to be mainly Liberals, Nonconformists or Jews.

3.1 Women's Role and 'Spiritual Motherhood'.

In chapter 1, it was shown how Froebel drew upon the practices of some mothers in the construction of his pedagogy. The role of the mother was seen by him as being of overwhelming importance in the education of young children thus Froebel specifically adressed his work to women.(23) His interpreters did likewise, notably the Baroness Von Marenholtz-Bülow whose first book published in England in 1855 was entitled Women's Educational Mission Being an Explanation of Friedrich Froebel's System of Infant

Gardens.(24) Propounding the notion that certain kinds of work were best done by women she wrote that:

> The position of woman, as mother, nurse and instructress of childhood, embraces the lofty idea of the female sex having been appointed by Providence to be the legitimate support of helpless humanity...(25)

Morley, in his account of the Ronge's kindergarten, cited in Chapter 1, noted that:

> Froebel desired his infants to be taught only by women, and required that they should be women as well educated and refined as possible, preferring amiable unmarried girls.(26)

Thus, what were required were not women in the abstract nor even mothers but women who were from the upper classes and who were refined. For such women, a role was envisaged which was more than mere child rearing; their work was to care for and be mother to society as a whole, a conception caught in the notion of 'Spiritual Motherhood'.(27) In the hands of many of Froebel's followers, Spiritual Motherhood had an active, shaping aspect as is evident in the following passage written by Eleonore Heerwart:

> In the hands of Women lies the power of steering the future weal or woe (and it is to women to mothers that Froebel speaks); and he reminds them of their mission in raising family-life, so that it may be a preparation for Heavenly Life - nay, even that there may be a paradise on earth in the lowliest home.(28)

The potential power of women is also present in the work of Emily Shirreff (1814-1897), the second President of the Froebel Society, who wrote that:

> The kindergarten alone will do much for the children, but we cannot alter the laws of God, and He has placed the mother as the true guardian, the earthly providence of her children; and ultimately what she does or leaves undone will make or mar their lives.(29)

It is noticeable that the passive, non-categorical theme in Froebel's thought is entirely absent in these views of the role of women. Although Froebel's allocution, in Althusser's phrase, hailed or interpellated (30) women it could not guarantee that they would recognize themselves within it. That some did requires an explanation which begins by looking at an aspect of the conditions which facilitated the acceptance of the Froebelian message among wealthy women in England.

3.2 The Employment of Middle and Upper Class Women.

In addition to Morley, Froebel's nephew, Karl Froebel, also broadcast the view that the best kindergartners were women recruited from the leisured classes. Karl Froebel, whose kindergarten at one time had Queen Victoria's son, the Duke of Edinburgh as a pupil,(31) felt that what was needed in the kindergarten were, 'the well-educated and accomplished young ladies of modern society'.(32) In a society so divided by class as was Victorian England this meant that, for him, the kindergarten could only be intended as an institution for the children of the ruling classes as the publicly provided infant schools, which catered for the children of the working class, were not regarded as suitable places for the employment of 'ladies'.

This identification between the kindergarten and the ruling classes was further strengthened by the social origins of the German' missionaries' who brought the kindergarten to England as most of them were connected to the landed classes or the older professions.(33) Some like Maria Boelte, who later opened kindergartens in the United States, came to England and became governesses to upper class families such as that of Lord Macaulay. Boelte also taught the daughter of Sir David Salomon and she became acquainted with such 'Grand Dukes' of Anglo-Jewry as Sir Moses Montefiore and Baron Meyer de Rothschild.(34)

But Maria Boelte is significant for more than her connections in high society for she was, in the language of the period, a 'redundant' or 'superfluous' woman. That is to say that she was a single, well-educated woman from a professional or landed family who was in need of employment. The journalist, W.R.Greg writing in 1862 in the National Review, drew his readers attention to the:

> enormous and increasing number of single women in the nation, a number quite disproportionate and quite abnormal(...) scattered through all ranks, but proportionally most numerous in the middle and upper classes.(35)

This increase was attributted by contemporary commentators to unstable conditions of business but other factors have also been cited such as the emigration of men to the colonies and the tendency for middle class men to marry late.(36)

One posssible means of securing paid work for ladies of gentle birth but few means was to become a governess. Estimates vary, but there were

around 24,000 governesses when the Froebel movement began in England in 1851.(37) Moves had already begun to professionalize the work of the governess. In 1843, the Governesses Benevolent Institution had been established. This was a combination of an employment agency, a housing association and a friendly society but its main significance for this account was its role, in conjunction with the Christian Socialist, F.D.Maurice, in the opening of Queen's College in London. This college, which commenced work in 1848, was intended to raise the educational standard of governesses. Queen's College was an Anglican institution and thus in 1849 a similar college for Nonconformists was begun in Bedford Square. This later developed into the Bedford College for Women.(38)

In addition to providing the two pioneers of women's schooling, Dorothea Beale and Frances Mary Buss, with an education, Queen's College was significant because as Peterson has argued, its function was to:

> widen the gap between those 'true gentlewomen' who were driven downward into paid employment and the ill-bred, upwardly mobile daughters of tradesmen and clerks who were trying to rise through the governesses occupation.(39)

At this point, when moves to exclude the daughters of the petit bourgeoisie from governesses posts are in hand, the Froebel movement with its claim to have an ideal system for the education of young children whether at home or in a fee paying kindergarten, arrives in England. At the same time, pressure to expand the employment opportunities for upper class women was also increasing and education was seen as having a central role to play in this struggle. The education of such women not

only gave them some skills it also ensured that those of lower social status who could not afford to acquire them were thus ineligible to compete for the limited number of posts available. In addition, the spread of schools for girls, in itself, provided new opportunities for the employment of educated women. Strong links existed between those who fought to extend women's educational opportunities and the leaders of the Froebel movement; links which provide an important clue as to the social basis of that movement.

3.3 The Froebel Movement and Girls' Schooling.

Girls were first admitted to the Local Examinations conducted by Cambridge University in 1865 and to those of Oxford in 1870. By 1894, there were over two hundred endowed and proprietary schools for girls, most of which were begun after 1850.(40) Of these schools, the ones most closely connected with the Froebel movement were the proprietary schools of the Girls' Public Day School Company. This company, like the Teachers' Training and Registration Society which was begun in 1876, sprung from the National Union for the Education of Girls of All Classes Above the Elementary. The National Union or as it was sometimes called, the Women's Education Union, arose, in 1871, from a series of initiatives launched by Maria Grey (1816-1906). At the time of the inaugural meeting of the National Union, Maria Grey was a widow and a woman who, as she put it, was 'free from absorbing home duties, with independent means and some brains'.(41) The daughter of a Rear Admiral, Maria Grey and her sister, Emily Shirreff, acquired the kind of rudimentary and haphazard education that was common for women of their class.(42)

Some of this experience was utilised in the sisters' first book on education, Thoughts on Self Culture which was published in 1850 and which contained the theme of the power of women which needed education in order to realise it fully.(43) This theme also appeared in a book written by Emily Shirreff in 1858 entitled Intellectual Education and its Influence on the Character and Happiness of Women.(44) In it she wrote that:

> what society wants from women is not labour, but refinement, elevation of mind, knowledge, making its power felt through moral influence and sound opinions. It wants civilizers of men, and educators of the young.(45)

The affinities between these views and the Froebelian version of the notion of Spiritual Motherhood are striking. This was a view which accepted the 'subordinate station' occupied by women 'on earth, in relation to men'(46) but nevertheless sought to construct a role for women, in the public sphere of work, which was consistent with women's supposedly, 'natural' abilities.

This view of the role of middle and upper class women was shared by others including those headmistresses of girls' schools whom Pedersen has labelled, 'Conservative Reformers'.(47) Their aim was that married women should have received an education which would enable them to perform 'more perfectly a subordinate, supportive, social role'.(48) The headmistress of Cheltenham Ladies' College, Dorothea Beale, told girls that if they did not marry, provided that they were well educated, they could 'find in some form of service the satisfaction of their higher nature'.(49)

In this sense, the German missionaries who brought the ideas and practices of Froebel to England found the ground well prepared to receive their

message in so far as it ascribed to middle and upper class women a specific, public role. Thus, Maria Grey and her sister may be described as Froebelians before they had encountered Froebel. The title of Emily Shirreff's book, The Kindergarten. Principles of Froebel's System and Their Bearing on the Education of Women, (50) which was published in 1880, knits together well the strand of women's education and the strand of Froebel and in a way which symbolizes the close connection between the two. The conception of women which was reflected in the views discussed above was one which came to be recognized as that of the 'new woman'. A new woman was one who was middle class and who had struggled to obtain an education. She was engaged in paid work and she fought for her emancipation from legal, social and political constraints. This model of women's role was defined in opposition to the dominant model of femininity, the 'perfect lady'. In its most ideal form, the perfect lady, according to Vicinus, 'combined total sexual innocence, conspicuous consumption and the worship of the family hearth'.(51) If this woman performed any social duty it was purely on a voluntary basis and never for pay.(52) The conditions which permitted the emergence of the 'new woman' were ones in which the demand for certain kinds of women's labour was increasing. To this structural level may be added the agency of women in struggle. A struggle which took a variety of forms but in the area of schooling was manifest in the pursuit of professionalization. Thus, Maria Grey argued before the Society of Arts, in 1871, for:

> the registration of teachers with such other measures as may raise teaching to a profession no less honoured for women than it is for men.(53)

4.0 Strategies of Professionalization.

Women entering the expanding field of girls' secondary schooling were at the forefront of attempts to constitute a teaching profession. However, secondary or 'middle class' school teaching, dominated as it was by the notion of the amateur gentleman, proved highly resistant to atempts to introduce a system of training for teaching. Training to teach was something associated with the elementary schools to which went the children of the working class and it was thus felt to be inappropriate for secondary school teachers. In addition, training was associated with a bureaucratized, state regulated form of schooling whereas, in the words of the Bryce Commission, secondary education was:

> served by men whose genius has been the passion to instruct, and by their invention and enthusiasm, which no Department could have created...(54)

However there was a price to be paid for teaching in institutions regulated mainly by the market and free from the bureaucratic regulation of the state. As Beatrice Webb observed:

> In contrast with the relatively simple world of elementary school teachers, the world of secondary school teachers, (...) shows a great variety in status, in methods of remuneration, in the other conditions of employment, and in the amount, kind, and quality of the work demanded.(55)

In the Nineteenth Century, the conditions and rewards of many male private tutors were little better than those of governesses but it was from among the ranks of the proprietors of the private venture schools that demands

for the professionalization of teachers of the middle and upper classes first arose. These demands led to the formation, in 1846, of the College of Preceptors (56) which took as its model the older professions of law and medecine.(57) Embodied in this model, according to Beatrice Webb, was an ideal consisting of:

> a combination of individual master-craftsmen, each dealing separately with his own public of individual consumers, and accepting, as subordinate members of the profession or craft, assistants and apprentices who had passed the tests which the masters had prescribed.(58)

But even those headteachers whom the Bryce Commission had lauded were not free to enter into contracts individually with each parent let alone with those who taught for them. In other words, the ideal of the College of Preceptors was made redundant by changing conditions and by the action of the state, which,in the form of the Charity Commission, began to play an increasingly more important role in the regulation of many secondary schools.

Nevertheless, the College of Preceptors persisted in its attempts to introduce a measure of training for secondary school teachers. In the furtherance of this end, it established, in 1871, a Lectureship in Education which, in 1873, was converted into a Chair of Education, the first of its kind in Britain. The holder of this chair was Joseph Payne (1808-1876), a former private tutor and private school proprietor.(59) Payne was also a member of the central working committee of the Women's Education Union and it was another member, Frances Mary Buss, the founder of the North London Collegiate School, together with a German

kindergartner, Miss Doreck of Württemburg, who induced the College of Preceptors to run a course of lectures on Froebel. These lectures were delivered by Payne between 1873 and 1875. (60)

4.1 The Foundation of the Froebel Society.

The two strands which have been discussed above, women's work and the professionalization of middle class or secondary school teaching were clearly represented when the London Froebel Society was established at the house of Miss Doreck in 1874. Prominent among those who founded the Society were the German kindergarteners, Eleonore Heerwart and Madame Michaelis, Joseph Payne and the leaders of the Women's Education Union, Maria Grey, Emily Sherriff and Mary Gurney.(61) That the struggle for women's education and the Froebel movement became inseperable is further demonstrated by the social and family connections of another who played a prominent part in the early Froebel Society; Caroline Garrison Bishop (1846-1929). Bishop had herself been a pupil at the Tavistock Place kindergarten which was run by Miss Praetorius who had taken it over from the Ronges.(62) Bishop's cousin, Adelaide Manning, whose step-mother was the first mistress of the women's college at Hitchin which later became Girton, became the Froebel Society's first secretary. Manning's step-mother, in 1870, was succeeded as mistress of the women's college by Emily Shirreff who, on the death of Miss Doreck in 1875, became president of the Froebel Society.(63)

The London Froebel Society was founded one year after a similar society had been established in the other main centre of Froebelian activity, Manchester. It was originally intended that the London Froebel Society should be:

> an association of trained and experienced kindergarten teachers, or at any rate, persons well versed in the principles of Froebel's system, which should become a centre for their general diffusion among the general public.(64)

This was found to be too exclusive and so membership was made open to all who supported the objects of the Society and who would pay the annual subscription of five shillings. To the objective of disseminating Froebelian ideas and practices, was added in 1876, another function of the society: the award of a certificate to successful candidates in an examination which it organized.(65) Thus, the Froebel Society was very closely involved in moves towards the professionalization of middle class teaching and this strategy, as it conflicted with the model of the teacher as a gentleman, sheds some more light on the extent to which the Froebel movement may be regarded as an oppositional formation.

4.2 Teacher Registration.

Among the organizations which sought to professionalize the teachers of the middle and upper class was the Teachers' Training and Registration Society. As has been pointed out, this organization sprang from the Women's Educational Union. Maria Grey was its organizing secretary and her sister, Emily Sherriff, was a member of its council as was Frances Buss. Another member, who was to play a part in the Froebel movement as well as in the movement to construct a science of education, was the Rev. R.H. Quick who lectured on the History of Education for the Cambridge Teachers' Training Syndicate which ran courses for secondary teachers.(66)

In 1879, one of the Teachers' Training and Registration Society's Vice Presidents, the banker and scientist, Sir John Lubbock (1834-1913), was involved in the promotion of a Bill, together with Sir Lyon Playfair (1818-1898) the chemist and former secretary of the Science and Art Department. The purpose of this Bill was, 'the Organization and Registration of Teachers engaged in Intermediate Education in England and Wales'. This Bill was lost but it was reintroduced by Lubbock in 1881. This too was unsuccessful due mainly to opposition from the elementary teachers' union, the National Union of Elementary Teachers (NUET), who objected to being excluded from the proposed register.(67) A further attempt to create a similar register occurred in 1890, when two Bills were brought before the House. One of these had the support of both the elementary teachers' union, now the National Union of Teachers (NUT), and a body called the Teachers' Guild. The two Bills got as far as the stage in which they were considered by a Select Committee but foundered on the problem of whether to include all teachers on the register, as the Bill backed by the Teachers' Guild and the NUT proposed, or only secondary teachers as was proposed in the other Bill which was backed by the College of Preceptors.(68) This was not the last attempt to create a register of teachers (69) but enough evidence has been marshalled to show that attempts to create such a register and bring all teachers together in a single profession were frustrated by divisions among teachers; divisions which reflected the class divided nature of schooling. In this professional project, the Froebel movement while opposing the traditional conception of the cultured gentleman was itself opposed by the teachers of

the working class because of its support for a register composed only of secondary teachers.

4.3 The Teachers' Guild and the Science of Education.

Another profesionalizing project which was supported by the Froebelians and from which they drew support was the attempt to found a science of education. This appeared in a variety of forms, one of which was institutionalized in the Teachers' Guild. This organization was formed in 1884 to unite all teachers in a single profession. Among its objects were the circulation of information concerning educational methods and movements in England and elsewhere and to provide welfare services such as homes for invalid and aged teachers.(70) Many leading Froebelians became involved in the work of the Teachers' Guild (71) which, in 1887, absorbed The Education Society.

The latter Society had been founded in 1875 by Charles Henry Lake and it was first known as the Society for the Development of the Science of Education. Apart from Payne, who chaired its first meeting, other prominent members of the Education Society included Quick and Joshua Fitch (1824-1903) an HMI and former principal of the Borough Road Training College. The leading members of the Education Society were all men but its incorporation into the Teachers' Guild appears to have made little difference to that bodies social composition. Commenting on the Guild's second General Conference, the Journal of Education which, in 1884 had been adopted as the Guild's 'medium of communication',(72) reported that, 'as a matter of course, the ladies in the audience outnumbered the gentlemen'.(73)

The fact that there is evidence to suggest that professionalizing strategies in education were supported more by women than by men has generally been overlooked in studies of that phenomena.(74) This commitment to the professionalization of secondary teaching is, as has been argued, what gave to the Froebel movement some of its oppositional appearance. It was also oppositional in that the Froebel movement sought to control the market for the schooling of young children by presenting the kindergarten system as a more rational approach to that of other private schools and by issuing its own certificates of competence. Initially, at any rate, the Froebel movement also confronted what Fitch called the 'inert and unintelligent discipline' which was the staple of the schooling provided in the elementary schools.(75) This also gave to the Froebel movement the appearance of an oppositional movement.

5.0 Froebelian Religious and Political Affiliations.

Much of the evidence concerning the religious and political affiliations of the Froebelians is fragmentary but some patterns are discernible. Both Nonconformity and Judaism were well represented within the ranks of the Froebel movement. Among the Dissenting denominations and sects the Unitarians stand out. Caroline Bishop, for example, was a Unitarian who came from a well known Unitarian family. Her father was a Unitarian minister and her mother was the sister of the Rev. Henry Solly, the founder of the Working Men's Club and Institute Movement.(76) Caroline Bishop's first cousin was the wife of the Unitarian minister the Rev. Philip Wicksteed. He was a member of John Trevor's Labour Church as well as an activist in the Settlement movement which will be discussed in Chapter 10.(77) Another Unitarian prominent in the Froebel movement was

William Herford (1820-1908). Between 1873 and 1886, when his daughter Caroline replaced him, Herford ran an experimental co-educational school called Ladybarn House at Withington near Manchester. As well as being instrumental in founding the Froebel Society in Manchester, Herford wrote an introduction to Froebel's ideas in the form of a commentary on the latter's Education of Man which was entitled, The Student's Froebel. This book was found by Sadler to be:

> the best English presentment of the educational doctrine which it summarises and expounds.(78)

Another Unitarian prominent in the Froebel Society also with Lancashire connections was Julia Salis Schwabe. She and her husband, the owner of a calico printing works, had converted from Judaism before moving to Manchester in 1832.(79)

In the United States, according to Karier, Unitarians were actively involved at this period in most social reform movements.(80) In England, in the Froebel movement at least they were also present. One possible explanation of this may lie in the content of Unitarian beliefs. For Weber, 'old dissent', which may be taken to include Unitarianism, represented a 'religious rationalization of the world in its most extreme form'.(81) Unitarianism was quite fiercely anti-traditional and rather in a way similar to the way in which Merton links science and religious dissent, Unitarianism may be linked to the anti-traditional, kindergarten system.(82)

This approach is faced by a number of problems as empirical studies have tended neither to confirm Weber's thesis nor Merton's argument concerning the connection between science and dissent.(83) If the Unitarian presence

in the Froebel movement may not be explained by a Unitarian, 'rational spirit' then other explanations must be sought. In broad terms, upper class Unitarians, in common with other dissenters, tended to be found, like the Birmingham, Unitarian, Joseph Chamberlain, in manufacturing rather than in commerce and finance which were activities dominated by Anglicans.(84) Thus it is conceivable that Unitarian intellectuals, linked to manufacturing, would seek educational systems which were 'modern' in the sense that they were, like the kindergarten, accompanied by a body of 'theoretical' justification and reject pedagogical practices rooted in custom and tradition. Moreover, as at one point the Froebel movement was dominated by a faction which presented the kindergarten as an essential stage in a programme of manual training, then support from those with connections with manufacturing would not be unsurprising. Speculation of this kind is, however, undermined by the fact that upper class Jews, who were associated mostly with banking and finance, also appear to be over represented among the supporters of the Froebel movement.

Of the Jews who were in the leadership of the movement, Claude Goldsmid Montefiore (1858-1938) was the most prominent. His mother was a member of the Goldsmid family which, like that of the Montefiore's, was one of the elite families of Anglo-Jewry which were linked through ties of business and marriage.(85) The young Claude Montefiore was educated privately and for much of that time he was taught by Philip Magnus (1842-1933), a minister at the West London Reform Synagogue who became an almost archetypal, 'industrial trainer' or modernizer.(86) Following Balliol College Oxford, Montefiore went to study in Berlin as had Magnus before him. On his return to England, Montefiore became invoved in the founding

of the Jewish Religious Union for the Advancement of Liberal Judaism. This was a radical reform group standing in relation to conservative Jewish Orthodoxy in rather the same way as Nonconformity stood in relation to the Established Church.(87)

Montefiore's career was somewhat untypical as, until the 1880's, few sons of the Anglo-Jewish elite attended the ancient universities. This was partly due to the barriers faced by Jews until the passing of the Universities Tests Act of 1871. But it was also due to the tendency for such Jews to seek to enter the City rather than the professions for which most university graduates were prepared. 'Amply endowed with wealth, learning and leisure',(88) Montefiore devoted his life to writing religious texts and fostering Jewish and non-Jewish educational ventures, among which was the Froebel Society. While in Berlin he had encountered the Froebel movement and, on returning to England he quickly became the honorary secretary of the Society and subsequently its Chair, a post he held until 1904.(89)

What conceivably, brought Unitarian and Jewish intellectuals to the Froebel movement was not so much their connection to the power bloc but their exclusion from the hegemonic culture of the mostly Tory, Anglican and landed capital fraction. Until, for example, the Prince of Wales introduced Jews such as the Rothschilds, the Sassoons and Sir Ernest Cassell into his 'smart set', they were not, on the whole, acceptable in 'society'.(90) Unitarians were in a similar position as was recorded by Molly Hughes who, while in charge of teacher training at Bedford College, was told by a wealthy member of the college council that Unitarians were 'looked upon as atheists, and by many as inferior socially'.(91)

One means of adapting to this situation for both Jews and dissenters was to convert to Anglicanism. In the case of Jews, this route, taken by Disraeli, among others, was not typical.(92) The situation was different with regard to Dissent which experienced a continuous haemorrhage of upper class adherents throughout the Nineteenth Century, a phenomena captured in the saying that 'a carriage never goes to a meeting house for three generations'.(93) A notable example of this process of conversion was provided by F.D.Maurice, whose role in the foundation of Queen's College has already been noted. Maurice was a convert from Unitarianism to Anglicanism.

For those outside the dominant religious culture who rejected the path of conversion, the establishment of kindergartens free from the control of the Anglican Church but nonetheless suffused with a high moral tone, may have been a welcome. It could also have been significant in securing their attachment to the Froebel movement. However, in the case of Manchester where many Jews were supporters of the newly founded Froebel Society the main reason for their support appeared to have more to do with the fact that they were from Germany.(94)

5.The German Connection.

It is, given the fact that it originated in Germany, not surprising that the Froebel movement contained within its ranks large numbers of Germanophiles. This observation is so obvious that it is surprising that it has largely gone unrecognized by most of the chroniclers of the Froebel movement in England. It is significant mainly because of the symbolic role played by Germany in the discourse of those forces in England which pursued a strategy of modernization. In many respects,

Germany occupied a similar position to that which the Soviet Union did in relation to scientists and other Left intellectuals in the nineteen thirties; Germany provided an image of the future.(95) As the French historian, Halévy observed, the 'Prussian model' acted as a pole of attraction for reformers in many fields.(96) Other countries often exert a disproportionate gravitational pull on English intellectuals and Quick, as early as 1868, noted Professor Seeley's remark that 'good books are in German' and added:

> I have found that on the history of Education, not only *good* books but *all* books are in German or some other language.(97)

In the early period of the Froebel movement's history, reports of its activities in Germany were brought to England in a form similar to that of travellers tales. After observing the practice of the kindergarten in Berlin, Philip Magnus, for example, recorded his reactions in a paper read to the Literary and Philosophical Society of University College in 1856.(98) Another vigorous supporter of the Froebel movement who had received part of his education in Germany, was William Mather (1838-1920). Mather subsequently was knighted and he also became the Chair of the engineering firm, Mather and Platt. In view of his support for the Froebel movement and manual training it is not insignificant that not only was he a Germanophile but that he obtained the European rights to manufacture Edison's dynamo which he did in his factory in Salford. The development of the dynamo, assisted Mather's firm in securing the contract, in 1889, for the electrical equipment for the first London Tube.(99) Not only therefore, was Mather somewhat unusual among industrialists in supporting

technical and manual training ventures but he was also engaged in one of the industrial sectors which required the application of science and which was one in which, from the 1890's, Germany excelled.(100)

The Politics of the Froebelians.

The characteristics of the leadership of the Froebel movement which have been selected for emphasis: its feminist aspect, its unorthodox and progressive culture and its attachment to Germany, all found a home in the great alliance of interests that found their political representation in the Liberal Party - although some tendencies, such as feminism, were less welcome than others. Mather, for example, sat as a Liberal Member of Parliament for three Lancashire constituencies between 1885 and 1904. Maria Grey passed the acid test of Radicalism by supporting Home Rule (101) and Julia Salis Schwabe and her husband had been friends of Richard Cobden, the leader of the Anti-Corn Law agitation. She was also an admirer and friend of the English Radicals' hero, Garibaldi.(102)

The Liberal Party, until the desertion of the Whigs over Home Rule, was a very broad church indeed. Within it the Radicals may have detested the aristocratic ideal and fought for modernization but theirs was a minority position within the party. However, until it was supplanted by Labour in the nineteen twenties, the Liberal Party was the party of popular education and it represented those who sought the extension of educational opportunity to the working class and to women. There were however limits to its programme of education, secular, free and compulsory. This did not include for a Froebelian, Progressive member of the London School Board the provision of free school meals.(103) On the other hand, as the individualism of Gladstonian Liberalism was supplanted by the more

collectivist, 'New Liberalism', many in the Froebel movement were able to adapt to and take advantage of the new situation. This may have been because some of the main articles of faith which Froebelians shared with liberalism remained unchanged. One of these was the power of schooling to effect a change in social relations. Another concerned the notion of self development which appears in J.S.Mill and which was restated in the classic of 'New Liberalism', written by L.T.Hobhouse and entitled Liberalism.(104) Liberalism, in the view of Hobhouse, was founded upon a belief in the self directing power of the personality.(105) This, in turn, was conceptualized in a way which bore a remarkable resemblance to Froebelian doctrine. In opposing coercion as the principal means of forming 'character', Hobhouse wrote that:

> Personality is not built up from without but grows from within, and the function of the outer order is not to create it, but to provide for it the most suitable conditions of growth.(106)

Despite the close similarity on a number of key points between Froebelian and liberal ideas and the examples of Froebelians who were Liberals, there were inevitably, exceptions. Towards the end of the Nineteenth Century following the revival of Socialism in the 1880's and the first signs that the Liberals could no longer represent organized labour, a number of Socialists became active in Froebelian circles. The most famous of these was Margaret McMillan (1860-1931), who despite her later criticism of Froebel, was for a number of years an active Froebelian. Margaret McMillan was a frequent contributor to a weekly paper called the Christian Commonwealth which was recommended to Froebelians by their own journal,

Child Life.(107) It was also recommended to Froebelians by Maria Findlay (1855-1912) who played a major role in fracturing the Froebelian orthodoxy and, after 1900, creating a revisionist Froebelian pedagogy. This paper was the organ of the League of Progressive Thought and Social Service which was founded by a London Congregationalist minister, R.J.Campbell.(108) The League was founded in order to 'provide spiritual fellowship for those who believe in Christianity without dogma' and to 'help spiritualize the social movement of the age'.(109) Christian Socialism as well as the 'religion of socialism' to which Margaret McMillan was attached, had an affinity to the the type of religious belief which pervaded the Froebel movement.(110) In both instances a strong ethical component was present which formed a basis for political orientation.

As well as these figures and others like the Anarchist, Edith Lupton, the first woman to be elected to the Bradford School Board, (111) the Froebel movement drew support from others who were not Liberals. Among these were Froebelians who were on the Right. In this category may be placed Claude Montefiore, who in 1888 stood as a Moderate or Church/Tory party candidate in the London School Board elections. Earlier in that year, Montefiore had been appointed to the Board as member for Tower Hamlets following the resignation of, Edward North Buxton a Liberal and a former chair of the Board. Montefiore was chosen specifically to represent the Jewish population of the area and in the election he was attacked by Annie Besant, the candidate of the Central Democratic Committee, for his support for voluntary schools and Jewish separatism.(112) Annie Besant topped the poll and Montefiore lost his seat. The appeal to vote for Besant which was made by Lewis Lyons, a Jewish trade unionist and issued under

the heading of 'Yiddish against Jewish', indicates that, in this instance, voting on class lines may have been more prominent than voting on grounds of ethnicity.

Both Montefiore and Besant were untypical of their class but both in different ways expressed the uncertainties of an age in which the old order was rapidly changing. It was also an age in which the cultural options available to those who wished to live their opposition to the culture of the power bloc's dominant fraction were rapidly multiplying. Of Besant, for example, George Bernard Shaw wrote that:

> She was successively a Puseyite Evangelical, an Atheist Bible smasher, a Darwinian Secularist, a Fabian Socialist, a strike leader and finally a Theosophist.(113)

These roles of Besant all had implications for schooling in that they were hostile to its content and to the forms in which it was provided. Consequently those outside the dominant bloc looked to alternatives, of which that provided by the Froebelians was the main one. Thus what emerged in the 1880's and 1890's among some sections of the middle class was a particular combination of Left or Radical politics and alternative forms of religion and culture which sought alternative forms of education. Within that framework, some of the labels changed over the period so that instead of Unitarianism, Theosophy became the religion most associated with the Left and with new forms of education. Thus in 1920, Joseph Wicksteed, the son of the Unitarian, Philip Wicksteed and the head of the experimental, King Alfred's School became a Theosophist.(114) Of the leading Froebelians, only Margaret McMillan appears to have been

connected to Theosophy (115) but among the Montessori inspired movements which supplanted the Froebelians, Theosophical belief and Soialist politics were common.(116)

Conclusion.

This Chapter has sought to explore the social basis of the Froebel movement and, by so doing, arrive at some preliminary conclusions regarding the ideological nature of Froebelian ideas and practices. From this discussion it is possible to conclude that the Froebel movement expressed in education the interests of those middle and upper class women who were seeking to break out of the role imposed upon them and create another one in the public world of work. It is against this background that the members of the Froebel movement became intimately involved in strategies of professionalization with respect to teaching. The Froebel movement also tended to represent, on pedagogic questions having to do with young children, the outlook of a slightly unorthodox fraction of the middle class which was radical in politics as well as in religion.

In this respect the Froebel movement was alternative rather than oppositional as it sought not to overthrow male dominance but to negotiate a space for women's work. In their political and religious affiliations also, the supporters of the Froebel movement expressed a desire for reform rather than the transformation of the social formation.

In its professionalizing and modernizing aspects, however, the Froebel movement can be regarded as an oppositional movement provided that it is recognized that what was being opposed was the traditional view of schooling associated with the Tory party and landed capital. This made it a natural ally of modernizing forces in education.

With regard to its internal structure, the Froebel movement until the turn of the century at least did show sect like characteristics. Largely confined to a middle class ghetto, the supporters of the kindergarten constantly sought ways out. A strange, in English terms, pedagogic system whose adherents persisted in using German terms for their practices, it is not difficult to see how sect like features arose within the movement particularly given its strongly religious character. However, that isolation was to change and how that began to come about is the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 3.

FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES.

1). See for example Dewey, J. (1956) The Child and the Curriculum and The School and Society. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. p. 4. (First published 1902 and 1899 respectively) Findlay, J. J. (ed) [1910] Educational Essays. London, Blackie. p. 13. Raymont. op. cit. p.278.

2). Williams, R. (1981) Culture. London, Fontana. For some preliminary reflections on this theme see also Williams, R. (1977) op. cit. pp. 115-120. and Williams, R. (1980) Problems in Materialism and Culture. London, Verso. pp. 148-169.

3). Williams. (1981) op. cit. p. 68.

4). ibid.

5). ibid

6). Adams, J. [1897] op. cit. p. 39

7). Weber, M. (1967) 'The Protestant Sects and the Spirit of Capitalism' in Gerth, H. H. and Mills, C. W. (eds.) From Max Weber. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. pp. 302-322.

8). Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1974) 'The Alleged Splits in the International' in Fernbach, D. (ed) The First International and After. Harmondsworth, Penguin. pp. 272-314. This contains numerous references to sects and sectarianism as does Marx and Engels (1934) op. cit. pp. 250-251.

9). O'Toole, R. (1977) The Precipitous Path. Toronto, Peter Martin.

10). ibid. p. 11.

11). Report of the Conference of Educational Associations 1914. p. 243.

12). For the number of teachers see: Mitchell, B. R. and Jones, H. G. (1971) Second Abstract of British Historical Statistics. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press p. 213. For the composition of the Froebel movement see: Webb, B. (1915b) 'English Teachers and Their Professional Organization'. The New Statesman. Vol. V, No. 130. p. 3.

13). Ronge and Ronge. op. cit. p. xii. Sim, M. F. (1885) 'The Value of Kindergarten Training'. The Bedford Kindergarten Journal. Vol. 1. No. 5. pp. 55-61.

14). Murray. op. cit. p. 68.

15). See notices in: Child Life. Vol. V. No. 17. 1903. p. 41. and Journal of Education. Vol. XXV. June. 1901. p. 387. Also Ward, E. M. J. (1906) 'Holiday Resort for Froebelians and Others'. Journal of Education. Vol. XXVIII. March. pp. 229-230. One of the objects of the Bedford Kindergarten Association was 'To organise holiday parties'. The Froebel Gazette. No. 7. Jan. 1900. p.1.

16). For an account of the distribution world wide of the kindergarten see: Vandewalker (1912) op. cit. pp. 601-604.

17). The first of a series of attacks by the Froebelians on Montessori was Anon. 'The Montessori Method' Child Life. Vol. XIV. No. 74. 1912. pp.173-177. Molly Hughes recalled how acrimonious relations between Pestalozzians and Froebelians were in the 1890's but there is little evidence to support this. Hughes, M. V. (1978a) A London Girl of the 1880's. Oxford, Oxford University Press. p. 233.

18). The New Education Fellowship began as a front for Theosophists who were joined by dissident Montessorians and enthusiasts for Psycho-Analysis. On the founding conference see: 'Conference at Calais' Times Educational

Supplement. Aug. 6th 1921. The entire issue of The New Era. Vol. II. No. 8. 1921 was devoted to discussing the conference and a report of it appeared as: New Education Fellowship [1921] The Creative Self-Expression of the Child. London, New Education Fellowship. On the Theosophy connection see: Lawson, M. D. (1981) 'The New Education Fellowship: The Formative years'. Journal of Educational Administration and History. Vol. XII. No. 2. pp. 24-28.

19). Williams. (1981) op. cit. p. 70

20). ibid.

21). ibid. p. 85.

22). On women and theories of class see: Garnsey, E. (1978) 'Women's Work and a Theory of Class Stratification'. Sociology. Vol. 12. No. 2. pp. 223-243. and Dale, A. Gilbert, G. N. and Arber, S.(1985) 'Integrating Women into Class Theory'. Sociology. Vol. 19. No. 3. pp. 384-409.

23). After 1840 at least. See: Bowen. (1901) op. cit. pp. 38-39.

24). Marenholtz-Bülow, B. M. von. (1855) Women's Educational Mission Being an Explanation of Friedrich Froebel's System of Infant Gardens. (Translated by Countess Krockow von Wickerode) London. Dalton.

25). ibid. p. 22.

26). Roscoe. op. cit. p. 113.

27). The phrase 'Spiritual Mother' is used in Ronge and Ronge op. cit. p.xii. For a recent discussion see: Allen, A. T. (1982) 'Spiritual Motherhood: German Feminists and the Kindergarten Movement, 1848-1911'. History of Education Quarterly. Vol. 22. No.3. pp. 319-339.

28). In Froebel (1900a) op. cit. p.xxix.

29). Shirreff, E. (1889) 'Froebel's Principles of Education'. Journal of Education. Vol. XI. Dec. p. 616.

30). Althusser, L. (1971) Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays. London, New Left Books. pp. 162-163.

31). See Karl Froebel's obituary: 'Karl Froebel' Journal of Education. Vol. XVI. June. 1894. p. 352.

32). Quoted in Stewart and McCann. op. cit. p. 305.

33). The Baroness is an obvious example of the former and Madame Michaelis, the daughter of a court physician, an example of the latter. Lawrence (1952) op. cit. p. 26 and p. 46.

34). Woodham-Smith. op. cit. pp. 43-44. For the 'Grand Dukes' of Anglo-Jewry see: Endelman, T. M. (1985) 'Communal Solidarity Among the Jewish Elite of Victorian London'. Victorian Studies. Vol. 28. No. 3. pp. 491-526.

35). Quoted by Vicinus, M. (1985) Independent Women. London, Virago. pp. 3-4.

36). The literature on this is reviewed by Peterson, M. J. (1980) 'The Victorian Governess: Status Incongruence in Family and Society' in Vicinus, M. (ed) Suffer and Be Still: Women in the Victorian Age. London, Methuen. pp. 3-19.

37). ibid. p. 4. In that year there were 24,770 women registered as governesses according to Armytage, W. H. G. (1970) Four Hundred Years of English Education. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. p. 130. But Purvis, citing the 1851 Census, claims that there were 20,058. Purvis, J. (1981) 'Women and Teaching in the Nineteenth Century'. in Dale, R. Esland, G. Fergusson, R and Macdonald, M. (eds) Education and the State. Vol 2. Lewes, Falmer. pp. 359-375.

38). Curtis, S. J. (1967) History of Education in Great Britain. London, University Tutorial Press. p. 171.

39). Peterson. op. cit. p. 18.

40). See: Pedersen, J. S. (1975) 'Schoolmistresses and Headmistresses: Elites and Education in Nineteenth Century England'. The Journal of British Studies. Vol. XV. No. 1. p. 148.

41). Quoted by Kamm, J. (1971) Indicative Past. London, George Allen and Unwin. p. 36.

42). ibid. pp. 16-17.

43). ibid. p. 27.

44). Shirreff, E. (1858) Intellectual Education and its Influence on the Character and Happiness of Women. London, John W. Parker.

45). ibid. p. 147.

46). Kamm. op. cit. p. 27.

47). Pedersen, J. S. (1981) 'Some Victorian Headmistresses: A Conservative Tradition of Social Reform'. Victorian Studies. Vol. 24. No. 4. pp. 463-488.

48). ibid. p. 464.

49). ibid. p. 469.

50). Shirreff, E. (1880) The Kindergarten Principles of Froebel's System and Their Bearing on the Education of Women. London, Sonnenschein and Allen.

51). Vicinus, M. (1980) 'Introduction: The Perfect Victorian Lady' in Vicinus, M. (ed.) Suffer and Be Still: Women in the Victorian Age. London, Methuen. p. ix.

52). For accounts of women's voluntary work in the area of schooling see: Edmonds, E. L. (1962) The School Inspector. London, Routledge and Kegan

Paul. Chapter 13 and Gordon, P. (1974) The Victorian School Manager. London, Woburn Press. pp. 181-189.

53). Quoted by Kamm. op. cit. p. 38.

54). PP. 1895. XLIII. op. cit. p. 106.

55). Webb, B. (1915a) 'English Teachers and Their Professional Organization'. The New Statesman. Vol. V, No. 129. p. 12.

56). For the College of Preceptors see: Rich, R. W. (1972) The Training of Teachers in England and Wales During the Nineteenth Century. Bath, Cedric Chivers. pp. 249-251.

57). For an account of the rise of this model see: Perkin (1969) op. cit. pp. 254-255.

58). Webb, B. (1915a) op. cit. p. 13.

59). 'Joseph Payne' in Monroe, P. (ed) (1914) A Cyclopedia of Education. Vol. 4. New York, Macmillan. pp. 616-617.

60). Woodham-Smith (1952) op. cit. p. 45. Kamm. op. cit. p. 87.

61). Woodham-Smith (1952) op. cit. p. 47. Murray. op. cit. p. 71. Raymont. op. cit. p. 241.

62). Last, H. (1936) Memoir of Caroline Garrison Bishop. London, Headley Brothers. p. 3.

63). Kamm. op. cit. p. 32.

64). Maria Grey quoted by Webb, B. (1915b) p. 2.

65). Woodham-Smith (1952) op. cit. p. 49.

66). Murray. op. cit. pp. 80-81. Rich. op. cit. p. 261.

67). ibid. p. 267. and Gosden, P. H. J. H. (1972) The Evolution of a Profession. Oxford, Basil Blackwell. pp. 237-238.

68). ibid. pp. 239-242.

69). The next major attempt followed the Board of Education Act of 1899.

70). Webb, B. (1915a) op. cit. p. 14.

71). They included Herbert Courthope Bowen (1847-1909) and Fanny Franks (1838-1920). See for example: Anon. 'The Teachers' Guild General Conference at Oxford' Journal of Education. Vol. XV. June. 1893. pp. 296-297.

72). On the Education Society and the relation between the Journal of Education and the Teachers' Guild see: Turner, F. C. (1887) 'The History of the Education Society'. Journal of Education. Vol. IX. April. pp. 178-180 and May. pp. 222-224.

73). Anon. 'Sheffield Conference of the Teachers' Guild'. Journal of Education. Vol. XI. June. 1889. pp. 311-322. The quote is from p. 322.

74). Notably by Gosden (1972) op. cit. and by Tropp, A. (1957) The School Teachers. London, Heinemann. Sexual divisions are, however, recognized in Parry, N. and Parry, J. (1974) 'The Teachers and Professionalism; The Failure of an Occupational Strategy' in Flude, M. and Ahier, J. (eds) Educability, Schools and Ideology. London, Croom Helm. pp. 160-185. and by Bergen, who considered only elementary school teachers, in: Bergen, B. H. (1982) 'only a Schoolmaster: Gender, Class, and the Effort to Professionalize Elementary Teaching in England'. History of Education Quarterly. Vol. 22. No.1. pp. 1-21.

75). Fitch, J. G. (1897) Lectures on Teaching. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. p. 198.

76). For Solly's work see: Simon (1965) op. cit. pp. 71-75.

77). See: Armytage, W. H. G. (1968) Heavens Below. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. pp. 321-323.

78). Dictionary of National Biography (DNB) p. 256. According to Professor L. C. Miall, Herford's book was 'the real door of access for English men and women'. Miall, L.C. (1896) 'Froebel. A Text and Commentary'. Journal of Education. Vol. XVIII. Sept. p. 532. It was also praised by HMI Rooper. See: Rooper, T. G. [1896] School and Home Life. London, A. Brown. p. 338. The book was: Herford, W. H. (1905) The Student's Froebel. London, Sir Isaac Pitman. (1st ed. 1893) This was an annotated translation of Froebel's The Education of Man.

79). Endelman. op. cit. p. 524. Woodham-Smith op. cit. p. 31. and Brown, C. M. (1983) 'Lancashire Industrialists and Their Schools 1833-1902'. Journal of Educational Administration and History. Vol. XV. No.1. pp. 14-18.

80). Karier. op. cit. p. 52.

81). Weber. (1952) op. cit. p. 147.

82). Merton, R. K. (1968) 'Puritanism, Pietism and Science' in Merton, R. K. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York, The Free Press. pp. 628-660.

83). Rubinstein (1981a) op. cit. pp. 145-163 produces evidence which contradicts Weber's thesis concerning the relation between entrepreneurial success and religion. On science and religion see: Cardwell. op. cit. pp. 6-8.

84). Rubinstein (1981a) op. cit. p. 157. O. B. Powell a teacher at the 'New School' of Bedales (opened 1893) noted that in its early days many of the children came to the school 'from thinking manufacturing families of Unitarian connection in the North and Midlands'. Badley, J. H. (1923) Bedales. London, Methuen. p. 71.

85). Claude Montefiore was also a great grandson of Mayer Amschel de Rothschild (1818-1874) the founder of the English branch of the Rothschilds. DNB p. 264.

86). For Magnus and his role in the education of Montefiore see: Foden, F. (1970) Philip Magnus. London, Valentine, Mitchell. pp. 45-46. and Cohen, L. (1940) Some Recollections of Claude Goldsmid Montefiore, 1858-1938. London, Faber and Faber. p. 37.

87). Endelman. op. cit. pp. 504-505.

88). DNB p. 625.

89). Child Life. Vol. VI. No. 21. 1904 p. 49.

90). And even then they continued to face barriers to their acceptance. See: Middlemass, K. (1977) Pursuit of Pleasure. London, Gordon and Cremonesi. pp. 14-15 and pp. 56-57. Endelman. op. cit. pp. 515-518.

91). Hughes, M. V. (1978b) A London Home in the 1890's. Oxford, Oxford University Press. p. 111.

92). Endelman. op. cit. p. 492.

93). Wilson, B. R. (1966) Religion in Secular Society. London, C. A. Watts. pp. 110-111. and Glaser. op. cit. pp. 352-363.

94). Woodham-Smith. op. cit. p. 42.

95). As Sadler recognized in Sadler. (1902a) op. cit.

96). Halévy, E. (1939) A History of the English People. Epilogue. Vol. 1. Book 2. Harmondsworth, Penguin. pp. 9-16.

97). Quick op. cit. viii

98). Foden. op. cit. pp. 49-50.

99). Armytage, W. H. G. (1969b) The Rise of the Technocrats. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. pp. 115-116.

100). Cardwell. op. cit. pp. 167-172.

101). Turner, A. J. (1921) 'Maria Grey' in Watson, F. (ed) The Encyclopaedia and Dictionary of Education. Vol. II. p. 757. More accurately, it was a test of loyalty to Gladstone. See: Adelman, P. (1984) Victorian Radicalism. London, Longman. pp. 123-139.

102). Anon. (1905) 'The Froebel Educational Institute'. Child Life. Vol. VII. No. 25. p. 42.

103). See: Rosamond Davenport Hill (1825-1902) DNB.

104). Hobhouse, L. T. [1916] Liberalism. London, Williams and Norgate.

105). ibid. p. 123.

106). ibid. p. 143.

107). Child Life. Vol. XII. No. 54. 1910. p. 38.

108). See: Pierson, S. (1979) British Socialists. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press. p. 145.

109). ibid.

110). Yeo, S. (1977) 'A New Life: The Religion of Socialism in Britain, 1883-1896'. History Workshop. No. 4. Autumn. pp. 5-56. Margaret McMillan is a central figure in Yeo's essay.

111). For Edith Lupton and the Bradford School Board see: Elliot, A. (1981) 'The Bradford School Board and the Department of Education 1870-1902: Areas of Conflict'. Journal of Educational Administration and History. Vol. XIII. No. 2. pp. 18-23. and, in particular, p. 20. On Lupton's anarchism see: Quail, J. (1978) The Slow Burning Fuse. London, Paladin. p. 88 and p. 129.

112). See: Rubinstein, D. (1970) 'Annie Besant and Stewart Headlam: The London School Board Election of 1888'. East London Papers. Vol. 13. Part 1. pp.

3-24. Montefiore was, ironically, an anti-Zionist and an assimiliationist see: Cohen, S. A. (1982) English Zionists and British Jews. Princeton, Princeton University Press. pp. 163-183.

113). Quoted in Smith, W. S. (1967) The London Heretics 1870-1914. London, Constable. p. 161. An intellectual odyssey comparable in the political distance travelled is described by Dora Montefiore who was elected to the first executive committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain. See: Montefiore, D. B. (1927) From a Victorian to a Modern. London, E. Archer. Montefiore supported the kindergarten movement in the United States and wrote for the journal of the English Froebelians: Montefiore, D. B. (1898) 'Co-Education'. Child Life. Vol. 1. No. 4. pp. 93-97.

114). Stewart. op. cit. p. 167.

115). For evidence of Margaret McMillan's leanings towards Theosophy see: Pierson, S. (1973) Marxism and the Origins of British Socialism. Ithaca, Cornell University Press. p. 162.

116). Two examples are the Theosophists, and some time Labour MP's, Leslie Haden Guest (1877-1960) and Major David Pole (1877-1952). Both were NEF activists.

Chapter 4

THE CONDITION OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLING AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FROEBELIAN PEDAGOGY IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN THE 1880's.

1.0 Introduction.

This chapter is concerned with a description and an analysis of the conditions, during the 1880's, which determined the outcome of the Froebelian project to replace existing elementary school pedagogies with the kindergarten system. A number of favourable conditions are identified. These include the attendance at school of large numbers of young children and the sympathetic stance towards the kindergarten of many large School Boards. To these favourable conditions may be added the attacks upon the prevailing form and content of elementary schooling by medical practitioners and by teachers seeking to free themselves from the system of payment by results.

But these favourable conditions were negated by the material circumstances in which mass schooling operated. By this is meant the large classes, the inadequate facilities and the demands of the Code. Instead however, of, as is customary, identifying the elementary school Code as the principal obstacle to attempts to implement the Froebelian pedagogy, here it will be argued that the introduction of compulsory attendance was a greater barrier. Compulsory attendance imposed on an unwilling section of the working class, it will be argued, had a considerable effect in forming and sustaining social relations of pedagogy inimical to Froebelian practice in the elementary schools. Compulsion, it will be argued, was

tantamount to a declaration of war upon the children of those termed the 'residuum'. Such children fought back against attempts to school them not just by truanting but in the schools also. In many urban schools teachers, with little to combat their unwilling pupils, resorted to methods which relied heavily on physical coercion and they decried the methods of the Froebelians.

However, although the Code is relegated in importance some of its effects are also discussed particularly with regard to the 'over-pressure' controversy. In the face of mounting opposition from teachers and abundant evidence that its prescriptions were unrealistic for many children of the urban poor, it was recognized, even by the more traditional elements who sat on the Cross Commission, which reported toward the end of the decade, that the traditional view of what counted as appropriate school knowledge was no longer sustainable. Finally, while the main focus of this Chapter will be upon the conditions of elementary schooling attention is also paid to the demands for a more 'practical' elementary school curriculum which were put by the modernizers among the Cross Minority and which gave rise to the ascendancy of a particular interpretation of Froebel's work.

2.0 The Growth Of Mass Schooling.

With respect to the schooling of the working class, the inadequacy of the market to supply what was generally felt to be required, had long been recognized by the state. During the late Nineteenth Century, a series of Acts established what amounted to a state monopoly of the schooling provided for the working class and in 1902, a national system of elementary schools was completed . While in some respects, the growth of

this system was of benefit to the Froebel movement as the expansion of the number of schools provided increased opportunities for the implementation of the kindergarten system, the conditions which attended the growth of elementary schooling were not, on the whole, favourable to the implementation of the Froebelian pedagogy. These conditions included large classes, inadequate or unsuitable buildings, poorly trained teachers and the pedagogic relations shaped by the Codes and compulsory attendance. Following the Act of 1870, the establishment of the school boards and the stimulus that this gave to the voluntary societies to build more schools, led to a rapid expansion in the number of inspected elementary schools. Between 1871 and 1895 the number of such schools increased by around 124% while the number of school places in the same period showed a 195% increase.(1) From the point of view of the Froebel movement, which was concerned principally with the education of young children, the most relevant category of pupils were those who were aged below seven years. This category even included a relatively small number of children who were less than three years of age. As a proportion of all children on the registers, the under sevens declined from 38.1% to 31.8% between 1871 and 1895. Nevertheless, throughout this period they constituted a large segment of the school population and one which, importantly, was largely excluded from the rigours of the annual examination which was laid down in the Elementary School Code.(2)

2.1 The School Attendance of Children Below the Age of Five.

The question of whether children below the age of five should be in school or not, was one which was largely left open by the Act of 1870. School Boards were authorized to frame bye laws compelling the attendance of

children between the ages of five and thirteen with the provision that children over the age of ten could claim exemption. Although five was the age at which children could be compelled to attend school, many schools accepted children who were younger. This practice was sanctioned by a tradition unique to England. The infant schools founded by Wilderspin, for example, took children at the age of two and the Home and Colonial Society trained teachers for 'babies' under the age of three and infants aged between three and six.(3) When, in 1846, Joseph Fletcher inspected the infant schools of the British and Foreign Society, the practice of accepting children in these schools at the ages of two or three was almost universal.(4) In the 1850's it was still widespread, a fact which drew unfavourable comment from Matthew Arnold.(5)

The reasons why such young children were accepted in school are many and varied but there is much evidence to suggest that the main one was that there was a widespread demand that they should do so. If that demand had not been met by inspected schools then it would be catered for by the 'Dame' schools which were private and unregulated. HMI Fletcher described the situation in the following way:

> It is not surprising that the mother of a working man's family, who is herself perhaps employed in some branch of industry, and almost invariably has all the labours of her little household to perform in a very narrow space, and in want of many common conveniences, should begin to consider children of even two or three years old very much "in the way" during a great part of the day, and be ready to make a sacrifice of some pence per

> week to have them safely bestowed in some "out-of-the-way" school"; an expressive designation which she is very apt to give to the little congregation of infants in the kitchen of some neighbouring dame.(6)

In general, HMI was hostile to the 'little congregation of infants' in the dame's kitchen. The main complaint of the inspectors, and of the Newcastle Commission of 1861, was that the dames did little direct teaching.(7) The infant schools, on the other hand, were praised for the 'opportunities' which they provided for 'mental development' but most of all for their inculcation of good habits.

An overwhelming concern for moral regulation and its converse, a fear of disorder, characterises elementary schooling at all levels during the early and middle years of the Nineteenth Century. Johnson's view has been alluded to in Chapter 2 but his point, deserves quotation as it so well captures the purposes of early and mid Nineteenth Century elementary schooling:

> Education was not thought of as the development of innate abilities, potentialities or skills. It was curative, regulative. Education should establish an inner restraint, a behavioural order.(8)

As Roberts has observed, the moment during which the 'rational' systems of the infant school societies began to receive support from the state was also the moment when the casual atmosphere of the dame schools, with their lack of concern for moral duties, came under the fiercest attack for posing a threat to social stability.(9) This point was expressed well by

Fletcher who claimed that children who had attended infant schools were recognizable as their:

> well-combed hair with wits as orderly, open countenances with gentleness of demeanor, show forth the praises of their former teachers, amidst the general rout of a British School, collected from the kitchens of the dames and from the disorder of the streets or even the home.(10)

In addition to the charge that the dame schools were unsuitable, from the moral point of view, Matthew Arnold feared that the contract between a parent and the dame school, which was similar to that which applied to all private schools, had consequences for the control of schooling. It led, he wrote, to 'the disposition of parents to interfere, and the diminished independence of the teacher'.(11) Thus the control of the dame schools by the working class was something that the state and the church were not disposed to tolerate as it threatened the twin objectives of both in education: the moral regulation of the working class.

The decision of the Education Department in 1872, to make three the minimum age for grant earning purposes, may be seen, therefore, as both a way of meeting the demand for child care and also as a blow aimed at the dame schools. (12) By the 1880's, although there were local exceptions,(13) the number of private schools patronised by the working class began to decline and the number of under fives attending inspected elementary schools increased sharply.(14) One of the consequences which flowed from the state permitting the attendance of children under five at

elementary schools was that the organization of their care and schooling was placed on the agenda of the newly established school boards.

2.2 School Boards and Provision for Infants.

In London, the first school board opted to make a bye law which compelled the attendance of children between the ages of five and thirteen as was specified by the Act of 1870. A sub-committee, chaired by T. H. Huxley, was appointed to draw up a scheme of school organization and to lay down a curriculum for the London School Board's schools.(15) This sub-committee recommended the establishment of infant schools for chidren under seven, junior schools for children between the ages of seven and ten and senior schools for those over ten. This form of organization was widely adopted by other large, urban school boards and it led to the establishment of separate infant departments in the schools run by those boards.(16)

With regard to the supposed benefits of infant education, Huxley's sub-committee declared that not only were children, 'withdrawn from evil and corrupt influences and disciplined in proper habits' but that they were also provided with 'positive instruction'.(17) This protective justification differed little from the earlier arguments for infant schools which have been discussed above.

Instruction in the London infant schools was to consist of:

> (a) The Bible and the Principles of Religion and Morality ...
>
> (b) Reading, Writing and Arithmetic.

(c) Object lessons of a simple character, with some such exercise of the hands and eyes as is given in the kindergarten system.

(d) Music and drill.(18)

From the point of view of the Froebel movement, the inclusion of kindergarten exercises is significant because it illustrates how elements of Froebel's pedagogy were selectively incorporated into existing practices but the kindergarten did not, as most Froebelians wished, replace the entire system. Nevertheless, like the schemes that the sub-committee proposed for the junior and senior schools, this was an 'advanced' scheme. The conception of elementary schooling held by the sub-committee was, by contemporary standards, a broad one but it was also one which paid little attention to the material conditions in which teaching and learning were to take place.(19)

Regarding the curriculum for infants, one of the main problems faced by the London School Board was a dearth of teachers familiar with the kindergarten system. In order to alleviate this, Caroline Bishop was appointed, in 1873, to the post of Instructor in Kindergarten Exercises.(20) Her principal task was to train, in the practice of the kindergarten, the women who had been newly recruited as infant teachers.(21) In 1875, attempts were made to differentiate the trained kindergarten teacher from other infant teachers and Bishop was authorized to award a certificate to a teacher, 'whose personal application of her kindergarten knowledge reached the standard required by the instructor'.(22)

Following her resignation in 1877, Bishop's place was taken by Marie Lyschinska, who had been trained by Froebel's grand-neice, Henrietta Schrader-Breymann. Lyschinska was given the title of Superintendent of Method in Infant Schools and her task was to secure, wherever possible, 'the application of kindergarten principles to the teaching of ordinary subjects'. In addition, she was required to give 'occasional model lessons illustrative of the mode in which this object may be secured'.(23) During the nineteen years for which she held the post, Lyschinska aroused the opposition of many of the teachers to whom she attempted to introduce the principles and practices of the kindergarten. Partly this was due to her autocratic manner but the main reason for the teachers' hostility seems to have been that the conditions in the schools were unsuitable for the implementation of her ideas.(24)

The action of the London School Board in taking these steps to promote a version of the kindergarten was imitated by other school boards during the 1870's as the number of schools increased and with them, the need for an effective practice of infant schooling. But the decision of the Education Department in 1875, that exclusive use of the kindergarten system with children under the age of seven did not meet the requirements of the Code, rapidly curtailed any enthusiasm for the kindergarten that the school boards possesed.(25) The view of HMI, which was far from monolithic, was nevertheless also important in containing pressure for the implementation of the kindergarten. In the view of E. M. Sneyd-Kynnersley, for example, an inspector of schools in the Chester district,(26) there was a class dimension to be considered. The Froebel system, he opined, 'does not raise the standard of instruction', it simply varies it 'with toys which are

called gifts'. The principal function of the gifts was, in Sneyd-Kynnersley's opinion:

> to amuse school boards and amateurs who imagine that what will do for children of the upper class will do for the children of the public elementary school.(27)

The clear implication of this view was that the children of the working class required a different pedagogy to those of the upper class.

3.0 The Social Relations of Learning in the Elementary School.

Having referred to the constraints imposed upon the spread of the kindergarten, in the early 1880's, by the material conditions of elementary schooling it is now necessary to specify them more closely. The most powerful structural constraint, leaving aside the requirements of the Code, was, arguably, that which flowed from the social relations of learning which were shaped by the compulsory attendance at school of a section of the working class. This requirement was imposed by the school boards, by Lord Sandon's Act of 1876 and by the Act of 1880 which compelled attendance. This Act required all school boards and attendance committees to make bye-laws compelling the school attendance of all children between the ages of five and thirteen but with provision for exemptions at the age of ten.(28) Compulsory school attendance, while introducing a measure of child protection, was bitterly resented by sections of the working class for not only did it remove a source of family income for poor families but as schooling was not free it also imposed the necessity to find the money for fees.(29)

3.1 The Demand for Compulsory Attendance.

The demand for compulsory attendance had been raised by the National Education League, a Birmingham based organization which had been formed in 1869 to represent the educational interests of an alliance of Radicals, Nonconformists and organized labour.(30) The case for compulsory schooling had also been made by, among others, J. S. Mill and John Ruskin.(31) Mill, in proposing the necessity of a relation between schooling and citizenship, posed the following question in his On Liberty, which was published in 1859:

> Is it not almost a self-evident axiom that the state should require and compel the education, up to a certain standard of every human being who is born its citizen.(32)

Universal education would, thought Mill, enable each person to, 'perform his part well in life towards others and towards himself'.

Ruskin's case for compulsion was linked to the more familiar behavioural conception of the purpose of education. In The Crown of Wild Olive Ruskin wrote that:

> Education does not mean teaching people to know what they do not know. It means teaching them to behave as they do not behave.(33)

On the eve of the Education Act of 1870, the Report on Schools for the Poorer Classes in Birmingham, Leeds, Liverpool and Manchester attempted to specify those whom HMI thought were most in need of being taught how to behave. In Birmingham, for example, HMI Joshua Fitch claimed that only 25.8% of the children of the 'poorer' classes, aged between three and

fifteen, were on the rolls of inspected schools. According to Fitch, a further 13.2% of these children were on the rolls of non-inspected or private schools which, in his view, were highly unsatisfactory as they possessed 'no distinctive religious character whatever'.(34) On Fitch's calculation, 61% of the children of the poorer classes in Birmingham attended no school whatsoever.

In Liverpool and Manchester HMI Fearon also claimed that large numbers of the children of the poor were not attending any type of school but that those who attended the uninspected schools were in a worse position. His argument was the familiar one of the inspectorate that attendance at many of these schools was, 'scarcely, if at all, to be preferred to vagrancy or truancy in the streets'.(35)

HMI, it may be argued, had a vested interest in exaggerating the number not in attendance at school and painting a picture of impending disaster unless the state provided more schools. As no clear distinction could be drawn between those who attended the dame schools and those who did not attend school at all, because attendance at the dame schools fluctuated according to the availability of work and the ability of the parents to pay the dame, the inspector's estimates of attendance are unreliable. But the Reports are valuable for the indication that they give of the kind of children who, in the view of HMI, were of most concern. HMI Fitch, for instance, made explicit his ambition to, 'bring the neglected children of the streets and the gutters under proper training'.(36)

3.2 Schooling the 'Residuum'

The children whom the Reports identified were the children of the 'residuum' a term which in Nineteenth Century usage generally referred to:

> an undeserving element whose main contact with the labour market was confined to those areas of economic activity where casuality of employment prevailed.(37)

One perceived feature of the life of those in the residuum to which education was frequently proposed as a palliative, was crime. Indeed, Forster when introducing his Bill in 1870, made clear his belief that ignorance and crime were closely connected.(38) In this respect, the Act of 1870 may be seen as being in line with other measures which arose in the 1860's which were part of an 'offensive' to moralize the residuum. This offensive was led by professionals who, in the view of Stedman Jones, constituted an 'urban gentry'.(39) Many of them were in the ranks of the Charity Organization Society (COS), which was formed in 1869 to put the distribution of charity on a rational basis, and they also constituted the bulk of the members of the urban school boards.(40)

For many of these professionals, especially those connected with the COS, the most pressing task was the differentiation of the residuum from the rest of the working class. Before this could occur, the residuum had first to be identified and its characteristics described. In the pursuit of this objective, HMI Fearon, in his report on Liverpool and Manchester, identified three strata within the working class and discussed their respective educational needs. The first stratum consisted of what he called, 'the independent and industrious labouring population' which he said was both skilled and respectable. This category was, he felt, well served by the inspected elementary schools which were run by the 'different religious congregations'. The second of the strata described by Fearon were the residuum which he called, the 'pauper and criminal class'.

This class, he thought, was also catered for by the asylum, the Poor Law, the reformatory and the certified industrial schools. Less well provided for were Fearon's third category, which occupied a position in between the respectable and the criminal strata. In this intermediate category, Fearon placed those who would have been industrious if there was a greater demand for unskilled labour, and independent, if they did not drink. Neither, 'wholly independent, nor yet quite pauper', wrote Fearon, this strata suffered the greatest 'educational destitution' as the managers of inspected schools took 'good care not to admit them'. As Fearon explained, the managers of these schools wanted pupils who attended regularly and conformed to school life in order to earn the maximum grant. Knowing that if they admitted children from the intermediate strata the children of the respectable would be withdrawn, the managers of the inspected schools excluded all but the 'independent' by fixing a high fee and insisting that the children were well clothed and attended regularly.(41)

3.3 A Traditional View of the Purposes of Elementary Schooling.

Without compulsion, the children of the residuum and Fearon's intermediate stratum would not or could not attend school but once such children were brought into the schools there was some uncertainty as to how and what they should be taught. Some aims were generally accepted by those supporting compulsion; for in contemporary analyses, the poverty of the residuum was attributed to individual inadequacy. Thus, poverty could be eliminated by the inculcation of the habits of thrift, regularity and industry in the children of the residuum. Problems arose however, over the question of whether such objectives were appropriate for the entire working class and, inevitably the debate took on a religious colouration.

In 1875, the Tory Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education, Lord Sandon, had the following note inserted into the Code:

> The managers and teachers will be expected to satisfy the inspector that all reasonable care is taken, in the ordinary management of the school, to bring up the children in habits of punctuality, of good manners and language, of cleanliness and neatness and also to impress upon the children the importance of cheerful obedience to duty, of consideration and respect for others, and of honour and truthfulness in word and act.(42)

This article was dropped from the New Code of 1882 by the Liberal Vice-President, A. J. Mundella after pressure from his advisers but it was retained in the Instructions to Inspectors. However after a protest from Sandon, who was then the Earl of Harrowby, Mundella consented to restore the article because, in the words of the secretary to the Education Department, Patrick Cumin, 'it might possibly be said that he was indifferent to the moral education of the children'.(43)

By itself the note is fairly unexceptional and is of a kind which is commonly found in official discourse on education.(44) It refers, at one level, to an almost universal purpose of schools, particularly for the young, which, in functionalist analyses, is referred to as socialization. However, Sandon does not appear to have had in mind the universal application of this objective. Instead, his was a characteristically 'traditional' view of working class educational requirements. His circular, for example, also contained the instruction that the memories of the

elementary school children were not to be burdened with subjects which were likely to be of no use to them but were to be filled instead with, 'noble and elevated sentiments' and 'patriotic feeling of regard for their country' in order that the character of their homes could be improved and raised.(45) As has been seen in the case of Ruskin, this notion that teaching elementary pupils appropriate behaviour was more important than the transmission of knowledge came in a variety of guises including, as will be discussed in chapter 10, that of a section of the Froebel movement.

3.4 Variations in Working Class Schooling.

Despite his narrow view of working class educational requirements, under Sandon, the Education Department added a Seventh Standard for older pupils to the existing ones and introduced what were known as specific subjects. Both of these measures were a response to pressure from the 'respectable' layer of the working class and they went some way beyond the limitations on the curriculum contained in the aim of the provision of 'elevated sentiments'. This pressure which was exerted by the respectable for a broader conception of schooling and more of it may also be detected in the figures for average attendance in inspected schools which, before universal compulsion, had reached 70.6%.(46) Thus compulsory attendance was, for the most part, a measure to bring into school the least tractable elements within the working class. It was not necessary to coerce the respectable as they had already consented to attendance at school.(47) Nevertheless, the effects of compulsion were to structure the relations between teachers and taught for all sections of the working class but with varying degrees of intensity according to the location of the school.

This variation, followed closely the spatial distribution of the different layers within the working class. Schools in the cities, through the mechanisms described by Fearon tended to reflect these spatial divisions and cater for the different layers within the working class.(48) Thus while many board schools were popularly received, as Philpott, the chronicler of the London School Board, recalled:

> In some districts of London building a Board School was like planting a fort in an enemy's country. The building was a symbol of tyranny and oppression, and often the school keeper had difficulty in protecting it from malicious damage.(49)

In London, securing school attendance was the duty of the school visitors. Initially, the School Board intended to employ mainly women in this capacity as it was felt that they would be less likely than men to excite opposition. They also had an added attraction from the point of view of the School Board as they could be paid less than men.(50) But the tendency of the mainly Tory magistrates not to convict for non-attendance coupled with the frequent attacks on the visitors caused the women to resign in large numbers and to be replaced by the 'School Board Man'.

4.0 The Teachers' View.

The resistance of sections of the working class to attendance at school opened up divisions in London and elsewhere between the teachers and the School Board and further contributed to the formation of a climate which was unreceptive to the Froebelian pedagogy. Some teachers, like G. A. Christian who taught in Bermondsey before becoming an inspector with the London County Council (LCC), recalled how he felt aggrieved that the

hostility of parents was expressed to attendance officers and teachers while the members of the School Board and its officers were securely entrenched in their offices on the Embankment. His recollections also record the incidence of 'fistic' encounters between 'roughs' and teachers both in and out of school.(51) A similar picture emerges from the memoirs of P. B. Ballard , who also became an inspector with the LCC. Ballard attributed the existence of the conflict between teachers and taught to a wide range of determinations but for him it add the consequence that:

> The odds were heavily against the disciplinarian who wished to use humane methods... He had not only to contend with large classes, ignorant parents, and graceless homes, but also with a scheme of studies that was arid and desolating. The grind for the annual examinations drove all humane culture out of the school. There was no belief in the goal and no joy in the pursuit. And in so bleak an atmosphere it was not easy to kindle enthusiasm or to cultivate friendship.(52)

In his desire to 'educate rather than subjugate', Ballard was out of step with the views expressed by the leadership of the London teachers' organization, the Metropolitan Board Teachers' Association (MBTA) as well as with the organized teachers of Birmingham.(53) In 1871 the London School Board had laid down that all responsibility for corporal punishment should rest with headteachers. Pupil teachers were expressly forbidden to use corporal punishment and, in 1874, the ban was extended to all certificated assistant teachers.(54) Some members of the School Board such as Helen Taylor sought the abolition of corporal punishment. Other

members who shared that ambition included Rosamond Davenport Hill and the Rev. Mark Wilks who were both supporters of the Froebel movement. These members were branded by G. A. Christian, who became a President of the NBTA, as 'sentimentalists' and 'fanatics' and he declared that they were, 'oblivious of the risks the teachers had to face in poor districts'. (55)

Christian's view was shared by James Runciman, who like Ballard, had been trained at the Borough Road Training College, the source of what was virtually an elite of male teachers who became active in the NUT and who later became local authority inspectors.(56) Runciman, who had been head of Blackheath Road Board School, subsequently became a journalist who tirelessly presented the 'teachers' case'. In his book Schools and Scholars, which was published in 1887, Runciman described the different categories of pupil which he, as a teacher, had come into contact with. These included those he called, 'delightful little folk', 'light-hearted pickles', 'ill-fed little creatures', 'little arabs' and 'criminal children'.(57) This latter category was described by him in terms used commonly to describe the residuum and the distance between Runciman's hereditarian views and those of the Froebelians is most evident. 'Criminal children' were, declared Runciman:

> born cankered, and you cannot change them; you can only force them to avoid contaminating others by their vileness, and you may possibly teach them a respect for authority which may prevent their spending much of their lives in the prison or the brothel.(58)

The criteria by which, according to Runciman, such children could be identified tended to fluctuate. In one version, he proposed that they could be recognized by their stigmata. The similarities between this approach and that of criminologist, Lombroso, are noticeable particularly whe Runciman described such children as, 'low-browed, ape-faced brutes'.(59) At other places in his book, behavioural criteria were utilised such as when he spoke of the way in which such children were prone to scribble, 'the most horrible indecencies and blasphemies on walls' and were, 'brutally insolent, rankly foul-mouthed, murderously revengeful and callous'.(60)

Like Christian, Runciman singled out the School Board for attack and by implication the principles underpinning the Froebelian pedagogy. The London School Board, he wrote, took:

> for granted that there are no wicked children; the gushers talk of moral suasion; but practical men know that you cannot try moral suasion on a young wretch who has not even an elementary conception of morality, and whose mind cannot assimilate the faintest idea of goodness. You must use the one argument that he understands; you *must* employ the short, sharp discipline of pain.(61)

There is something about this view that has a timeless quality about it. Also the way in which Runciman connected the resistance of some working class children to attempts to make them moral, to working class political resistance to bourgeois rule is also sufficiently familiar to permit the dismissal of Runciman as a typical reactionary.

Behind the famous riot which took place on the 8th February 1888,(62) Runciman detected the influence of liberal members of the Board and warned that:

> When the howling hordes from the East-end inflamed by the senseless leaflets which their Board School education enables them to read, shall make their next raid on the comfortable quarters, perhaps sensible folk will regret that respect for law, respect for decency, and respect for order were throttled by gushing crotcheteers who have made our roughest schools almost useless.(63)

However it would be mistaken to regard Runciman's attack on the school board merely as the baseless polemics of a reactionary for, as Ballard shows, teachers in many areas of London, particularly after compulsion was introduced, had great difficulty in securing the consent of their pupils to the procedures of schooling. In other words, behind the demand to retain corporal punishment and the denigrating labels applied to the residuum was the day to day experience of continuous classroom warfare which was frequently marked by mutual assaults carried out by teachers, parents and pupils.

In addition, Runciman does seem to have been articulating the MBTA position and not merely expressing prejudices of his own making as, after further pressure from the union, the Board relented and altered the regulations so that heads could delegate the administration of corporal punishment to their assistant teachers.(64)

How far, in this respect, London was typical of other cities is hard to say. A similar struggle between teachers and the school board ocurred in Birmingham but even if this was not the universal pattern, the views on this issue of organized teachers in London during the 1880's are of particular significance because of the extent to which the London School Board promoted a version of the Froebelian pedagogy in the infant schools which it controlled. If the teachers in an authority which viewed that pedagogy favourably were not disposed accept one of its main principles then little could be expected from teachers in authorities which were hostile to it. On the question of whether the London teachers attitude to corporal punishment was typical, in 1905, in Aberdare, when the Education Committee passed a resolution depriving them of the right to use corporal punishment, all the Certificated Assistant teachers tendered their resignations.(65)

5.0 The Over-Pressure Controversy.

Compulsory attendance together with the requirements of the New Code of 1882, which will be discussed in the next chapter, combined in the 1880's to provide the conditions which gave rise to the first major attack on the system of payment by results. This attack was mounted by a diverse alliance which even included some who were hostile to the reform and extension of elementary schooling. Its main 'theoretical' weapons however, were provided by medical discourse and its central dynamic was provided by the organized teachers of the NUET.(66) Over-pressure, as Sutherland has concisely described it, referred to, 'the strains produced in children by mental activity generally and school work in particular'.(67) The origins and extent of the debate about over-pressure

are beyond the boundaries of this discussion but it is worth referring to, however briefly, for the following reasons: Firstly, because of the way in which the debate contained a bid by neurophysiologists such as Dr. James Crichton-Browne (1840-1938), a former Director of the West Riding Asylum and the Lord Chancellor's Visitor in Lunacy, to colonize an emerging 'scientific' discourse on education.(68) As evidence of this bid, in 1884, after much public debate on the issue, the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education, A. J. Mundella, invited Crichton-Browne to visit some London schools and prepare a report. The report which Crichton-Browne produced drew extensively, and as will be seen in chapter 10 not perhaps coincidentally, upon Froebelian notions and concluded that the Standards meant that:

> the clever children must be practically kept back much to their mental and moral detriment, and the backward children must be stimulated to a rank, spongy brain growth, and to a straining effort that wrenches the whole system and may permanently damage health.(69)

This report when completed was, at first, suppressed by the Education Department but it was eventually released accompanied by a memorandum critical of Crichton-Browne's methods and conclusions which was written by HMI Joshuah Fitch.(70) Nevertheless, the relationship between the Froebel movement and a wing of the medical profession began, from this point, to develop and this alliance, as will be seen in chapters 10 and 11, was able to mount a sustained critique of existing educational practices.

5.1 Classification By Ability: The Teachers' Case.

A second reason for referring to the over-pressure controversy is that it unearthed a great deal of support among teachers for what was later to be called, streaming. Simon has rightly noted that the demand by teachers to be free of the standards, arose in conjunction with the expansion of places in the Higher Grade schools which provided advanced work for older pupils. (71) However, in connection with this issue, the NUET spoke of the 'especially heavy burdens' put upon 'weak and dull children' by the Code and the way that it assumed 'that all scholars can progress at the same rate'.(72) In its memorial to the Cross Commission, the NUET demanded the abolition of the payment by results system and its replacement by some other means of grant distribution which would, among other things:

> (2) Prevent "cram" and encourage intelligent rather than mechnical methods of teaching.
>
> (3) Render possible a rational programme of instruction, capable of being adapted to varying circumstances and localities.
>
> (4) Restore to teachers the liberty of classifying their scholars with sole regard to their attainments and abilities.(73)

Not for the last time were demands for more teacher autonomy to be linked to what were purported to be chidren's educational needs. Homogenous ability groups have long been held by teachers, as will be seen below, to be easier to teach than those which included what the NUET described as 'weak and dull children' especially when such teaching groups were in often in excess of sixty children. But leaving aside these considerations, the characteristically Froebelian notion that children's needs should be taken

into account when framing a curriculum, was in this memorial, put into circulation by the NUET which was to become a powerful collective actor in the domain of educational policy formation.(74)

Many of the teacher witnesses to the Cross Commission gave evidence in support of the NUET's position. Miss Whittenbury, for example, who was the head of Sidney Road Board School, Homerton stated that she would welcome the opportunity to classify children by their abilities and not by the standards as sometimes the children at her 1d a week school were 'delicate and half fed' and could not do the work.(75) Moreover, she told the Commission that payment by results was 'very wrong' because:

> It tends to the neglect of clever children and to keep them back.[...] We have to work so hard at the dull ones to try to get them up that the others are neglected, and then we very seldom succeed with those dull ones; and if they do pass they are like forced plants.(76)

Robert Wild, head of Byron Street Board School in Poplar and a former President of the NUET, estimated that from the point of view of, 'the children's interests and the children's abilities' from 40 to 50 per cent were wrongly classified.(77) When Wild was asked how the weak children were to be protected if payment by results was abandoned he rejected the implication that teachers ever neglected children but, towards the end of this particular exchange, he asserted, in a way which revealed a strong faith in rationality, that there would no longer be backward children, 'when they were properly classified'.(78)

These kinds of arguments were similar to the Froebelian belief in fitting education to the needs of the child and the Froebelian argument clearly

held the potential to be mobilised in support of streaming. Conversely, the demand for greater differentiation along the lines of ability contained within it the possibility that the kindergarten would become more widespread in the elementary schools as it placed less importance on the three R's and was thus more appropriate for the less able. Thus a space for the kindergarten to expand into was created as a result of the perceived inappropriateness of much of the elementary school curriculum for the children of the residuum. Miss Whittenbury, for example, told the Cross Commission that she felt that Standard 1 Geography was too difficult as it was 'beyond the capacity' of her children to, 'explain a plan of the schoolroom, the playground, the Cardinal points and the idea and use of the map'.(79) A similar point was made by Miss Fox, a teacher of the Irish poor in Manchester who remarked that:

> The grammar syllabus, such as it is, might be useful to a better class of children, to prepare them for higher studies and serving as mental training; but our children really do not need that.(80)

Two interrelated points were being made here. Firstly, that many children in the working class were either physically or mentally, incapable of passing the standards. Miss Fox, for example, told the Commission how her children suffered:

> more from sickness than the better class of children, because poor food and badly ventilated homes undermine their constitutions and predispose them to illnesses that are prevalent at the time.(81)

Alfred Bourne, on the other hand, a Froebelian and the Secretary to the British and Foreign School Society, spoke not of poor physical development but of children's 'capacities' and he held the view that, 'on the average', the 'child of the lower stratum' was less fit for intellectual work' than those whose parents could afford to pay the fees.(82) Moreover, over-pressure, in Bourne's view, resulted from:

> trying to put a good deal more into the children than they are able to receive; [and] that instead of a development of the children's faculties there is an effort to fill them with something for which they are not prepared.(83)

The Froebelian provenance of this remark is unmistakeable as was his suggestion that, for the residuum:

> The powers of observation, the powers of reasoning, or the powers of memory need not be developed by a study of history or geography. The same mental development might be secured by something that was handier to the children, in which they had more interest and of which they could grasp the ideas better.(84)

The second point, which was evident in the remarks of Miss Fox, was a utilitarian one. It consisted of the argument that as a literary curriculum was only of use to those who might gain a scholarship, there was little point, for the majority of elementary school children in following a literary course. This view was put with some force by Richard Balchin, the head of Nunhead Passage School which was situated in an area

which he described as 'a very low and benighted spot'.(85) In response to a question from Lyulph Stanley, Balchin argued that:

> if I intended my son to be a Spitalfields weaver, it would be folly to allow him to spend the greater part of the later years of school life in the study of Greek.(86)

With an apparent disregard for the fact that few opportunities for the study of Greek existed in the elementary schools, he continued by arguing that while it was not necessary to assume that, 'people are born into this world with a label around their necks' which dictated their social class location:

> as a matter of fact, the vast majority of the half million of our London Board School boys will become artizans or journeymen, mechanics or labourers.(87)

This is indisputably the language of industrial training and Balchin, by presenting to the Commission, schemes for the teaching of science and the provision of technical instruction, justified further the view that he was representative of those who saw schooling as a means to modernize industry.(88) Potentially, this position contained advantages for the Froebelians in so far as it was critical of the traditional, literary, approach to elementary school knowledge.

5.2 The Instrumentary Education.

The chief objective of the framers of the Revised Code in 1862, was to provide a basic minimum of instruction for 'the children belonging to the classes who support themselves by manual labour'.(89) Repeatedly, changes were made to the original Code. It was altered and a more expanded notion of elementary schooling developed but the model for much of what

constituted the curriculum of that notion and the theory of learning which justified it, was the practice of the secondary or the 'middle class' school.

Thus Arnold, in his reports, welcomed the provision of class subjects and, for a while, he pleaded - without success - that Latin would make a suitable one. He also defended, on the grounds that they were 'formative', a place in the elementary curriculum for Grammar, Geography and Poetry.(90) But he disparaged activities such as Needlework, Domestic Economy, Cookery, Technical Instruction, Gymnastics and Drill on the grounds that they could not provide 'mental training'.(91) In his revised version of classical humanist education for the working class, Arnold reserved a place for applied science but stressed that before science could be used:

> a man must, in general, have first been in some measure *moralised*; and for moralising him it will be found not easy, I think, to dispense with those old agents, letters, poetry, religion.(92)

In practice, these sentiments led to the situation described by Miss Fox and to many hours being spent Parsing. This disregard by the framers of the Code for what children were capable of learning was also reflected in and questions to children posed by HMI on their annual inspections. An example of such a question included the following which was related to the Cross Commission by Robert Wild:

> If Mary goes to market every Wednesday and sells so many eggs and gains 2s 4d on every three Wednesdays out of four, and loses 4s 9d on the fourth, how much does she gain or lose in the year? (93)

5.3 The Cross Commission and the Elementary School Curriculum.

As far as the Cross Commission was concerned, the outcome of its perception that the old educational order in the elementary schools was unable to continue was a number of recommendations to do with the curriculum. These may be seen as an attempt to move towards an elementary school curriculum which took seriously the transmission of work related skills. For the most part, this shift resulted from a growing disquiet over what was felt to be the inability of schools to produce appropriate kinds of labour. Many witnesses articulated this fear but Roscoe's claim that, 'the present system of elementary instruction tends to manufacture clerks and not artisans', was characteristic.(94) But as the Commission was split, broadly into a Tory/Anglican Majority and Liberal/Nonconformist Minority, the acceptance by the Commissioners of this modernizing slogan was not universal and the support for a more 'practical' curriculum was uneven.

Taking the view of the Majority first. In some respects, the Majority harked back to a more traditional view of elementary schooling than that presented by Arnold. The principal objective of elementary schooling according to the Majority:

> should be the elevation of those classes of the community for whom the education is designed.(95)

This was to be achieved, primarily through the teaching of religion and it recommended that HMI be given 'general, fundamental and fixed instructions' which made:

> it an essential condition of the efficiency of a public elementary school, that its teaching should comprise

> such matters as instruction in duty and reverence to parents, honour and truthfulness in word and act, honesty, consideration and respect for others, obedience, cleanliness, good manners, purity, temperance, duty to country, the discouragement of bad language and the like.(96)

After moralisation, came the subjects of the curriculum which, recommended the Majority, ought to be modified in order that they become more practical. It was also recommended that they be taught, 'to meet the industrial requirements of different districts'.(97) Notably, girls were thought to be in most need of a vocational training; Needlework, stated the Majority, ought to be, 'thoroughly practical and efficient'.(98) In addition, 'good and economical cottage cookery'(99) together with, 'instruction in elementary principles of physiology' would, it was suggested, enable girls to appreciate 'in after-life, the practical maxims which secure health in a household'.(100)

Boys on the other hand, were not, it was argued, to be taught a trade in school but some elementary instruction in science was held, by the Majority, to be, 'only second in importance to the three elementary subjects'.(101) Other pertinent recommendations of the Majority included the making of Drawing compulsory for boys and the possible inclusion of manual instruction in the use of tools. Significantly, these proposals followed closely those given in evidence by Sir Philip Magnus, a leading advocate of science, manual training and kindergarten.(102)

As might have been expected from a Minority which included industrial and scientific modernizers such as Sir John Lubbock and Bernhard

Samuelson,(103) the strongest arguments for the inclusion of skills training in the elementary schools came from this group of Commissioners. Technical Instruction, defined as a preliminary training for commercial or industrial occupations, had no place in the elementary schools below Standard 3, contended the Minority, but Manual Instruction did. This was defined as 'a training of the hand and eye' which provided a general preparation for a future career.(104)

With regard to the problem of the standards, the Majority wished them to be revised and modified and that teachers be given, 'perfect freedom of classifying scholars according to their attainments and abilities'.(102) The Minority also recommended that in infant schools, classification by age should be replaced by classification based on the, 'intelligence, attainments, and physical development ' of the children.(105) These recommendations are of particular significance because they accept for the first time in such a Report that the condition of the pupil should be taken into account when devising a curriculum which is appropriate for it and not just current views about the desirability of certain curriculum contents. In making these recommendations the Minority on the Cross Commission inclined to the child centred point of view. While the Froebel movement, due to sympathetic figures like Magnus, had some effect on this shift in emphasis, it cannot be said to have been the chief among the determinants. Those, undoubtedly, were the opposition of organized teachers to the standards and their implementation and the presure from modernizers concerned by perceptions of Britain's industrial decline.

6.0 Conclusion.

In this Chapter an attempt has been made to assess whether or not the conditions of elementary schooling were favourable for the introduction of the Froebelian pedagogy in the 1880's. Overall, the evidence discussed points strongly away from those conditions being described as favourable. Foremost among the barriers to the implemetation of any kind of pedagogy which was not based on coercion were the pedagogic relations shaped by the compulsory attendance of all children and the Codes. Compulsory attendance, it has been argued was aimed primarily at those referred to as the residuum and it sprang from anxieties about that layer's potential for social disruption. In the eyes of traditional figures like Lord Sandon the schooling required by the residuum consisted of moral and patriotic lessons; anything else was an irrelevence. Teachers' leaders like Runciman and Christian were only too willing to share this traditional view of what the residuum required and to decry attempts to introduce a more humane regime into the schools believing, not as the Froebelians did in the innate goodness of children but, in the innate badness of the 'criminal children'. For the respectable working class, elementary school fare was insufficient and the residuum, once coerced into attendance, according to the teachers cited here, acted as a brake on their promotion to higher standards. Moreover, the curriculum of the elementary school had expanded until, by the 1880's, it had become, under the guidance of figures like Arnold, a rather pale shadow of that provided in secondary schools. For the Cross Minority and others seeking to come to the aid of industry this development was regarded as being deplorably inappropriate. This pressure from the industrial modernizers, together with the over-pressure

controversy, breached the hold of the traditional conception of what elementary schools were for and how they should be conducted. By so doing it opened a space for Froebelian methods.

The relation between this trend towards a practical or vocational curriculum and the Froebel movement will be discussed in chapter 6 but as the kindergarten was one of the few mehtods suited to young children which was not based on a literary curriculum and all the assumptions which that contained, the move towards a more practical curriculum virtually ensured the support and involvement of the Froebelians.

In addition, some support for Froebelian methods existed on the London School Board, among some HMI and among those who formed the Minority on Cross. Added to this the schools, with the support of HMI, continued to take very young children even though the attraction of the Dames was waning. This also opened a space for a pedagogy which was not overwhelmingly a literary one.

Overall, however, although these signs were favourable, there was little evidence in the 1880's that the Froebel movement's pedagogy would be implemented in the elementary schools in such a way as to replace the existing forms of pedagogy. How the leading Froebelians judged the situation and what strategies they adopted in order to secure the general adoption of the kindergarten will be the subject of the following chapter.

Chapter 4.

FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES.

1). Percentages based upon the statistics given on p. 48 in Sadler, M. E. and Edwards, J. W. (1897) 'Public Elementary Education in England and Wales, 1870-1895' in Education Department. Special Reports on Educational Subjects. Vol. 1. pp. 1-71.

2). Six to seven year olds were entered for the examination at Standard 1. A grant of 10 shillings was made available under the New Code of 1871 if children between the ages of four and seven were taught as a separate department. In 1872 a further condition was added which laid down that they had also to be taught by a certificated teacher. ibid. p. 36.

3). Board of Education. (1933) Report of the Consultative Committee on Infant and Nursery Schools. London, HMSO. pp. 4-11.

4). Fletcher. op. cit. pp. 242-247.

5). Marvin. op. cit. p. 14 and p. 76.

6). Fletcher. op. cit. p.216.

7). See: Leinster-Mackay, D. P. (1976) 'Dame Schools: A Need for Review'. British Journal of Educational Studies. Vol. XXIV. No. 1. pp. 33-48. and Board of Education (1933) op. cit. pp. 17-18.

8). Johnson (1976) op. cit. p. 48.

9). Roberts, A. F. B. (1972) 'A New View of the Infant School Movement'. British Journal of Educational Studies. Vol. XX. No. 2. p. 162.

10). Fletcher. op. cit. p. 235.

11). Marvin. op. cit. p. 4. See also: PP. 1870. LIV. Reports on Schools for the Poorer Classes in Birmingham, Leeds, Liverpool and Manchester. p. 54.

12). Roberts. op. cit. p. 163.

13). In Taunton, for example. See the remarks of HMI R. F. Boyle in Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1881-2. p. 264.

14). The percentage increase in the number of under fives on the elementary school registers was as follows:

1871-1875	28.7%
1875-1881	10.6%
1881-1885	6.0%
1885-1891	8.4%

Based on Sadler and Edwards op. cit. p. 51.

15). Philpott, H. B. (1904) London at School. London, T. Fisher Unwin. pp. 33-36. Maclure, S. (1970) One Hundred Years of London Education 1870-1970. London, Allen Lane. pp. 39-44.

16). Board of Education (1933) op. cit. p. 20.

17). ibid.

18). Raymont op. cit. p. 235. Maclure. op. cit. p. 39.

19). ibid. p. 43. Philpott. op. cit. p. 35.

20). Last. op. cit. p. 3. Board of Education (1933) op. cit. p. 25. Raymont. op. cit. p. 239.

21). Huxley's sub-committee had recommended that only women should teach infants whereas previously infants had been taught by men. Roberts. op. cit. p. 160.

22). Board of Education (1933) op. cit. p. 25.

23). Raymont. op. cit. pp. 239-240.

24). Gautrey, T. (1937) Lux Mihi Laus: School Board Memories. London, Link House. p. 114. Rosamond Davenport Hill defended the teachers who took the kindergarten course by arguing that it was difficult to teach and learn at the same time. The Health Exhibition Literature. Vol. XIII. 1884. London, William Clowes. p. 91.

25). Lilley. op. cit. (unpublished) pp. 108-109.

26). A biographical sketch of Sneyd-Kynnersley is contained in Leese. op. cit. pp. 174-176. See also: Sneyd-Kynnersley, E. M. (1908) HMI. Some Passages in the Life of One of H. M. Inspectors of Schools. London, Macmillan.

27). Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1878-9.

28). Smith, F. (1931) A History of English Elementary Education 1760-1902. London, University of London Press. pp. 298-209.

29). For details of resistance to the imposition of compulsory attendance see: Rubinstein, D. (1969) School Attendance in London, 1870-1906. A Social History. Occasional Papers in Social History No 1. Hull, University of Hull. Lewis, J. (1982) 'Parents, Children, School Fees and the London School Board 1870-1890'. History of Education. Vol. 11. No. 4. pp. 291-312. and Kynaston, D. (1976) King Labour. London, George Allen and Unwin. p. 103.

30). For the National Education League see: Simon. op. cit. (1974) pp. 363-364. For the alliance between the Liberals and the respectable trade unionists see: McCann, W. P. (1970) 'Trade Unionists, Artisans and the 1870 Education Act'. British Journal of Educational Studies. Vol. XVIII. No. 2. pp. 134-150.

31). The Oxford philosopher T. H. Green was another professional intellectual who advocated compulsory attendance. See: Fowler, W. S. (1961) 'The

Influence of Idealism Upon the State Provision of Education'. Victorian Studies. Vol. IV. No. 4. p. 339.

32). Mill. op. cit. p. 160.

33). Ruskin, J. (1890) The Crown of Wild Olive. London, George Allen. (5th ed.) p. 185.

34). PP. 1870. LIV. op. cit. pp. 21 and 56.

35). ibid. p. 135.

36). ibid. p. 58.

37). Treble, J. H. (1983) Urban Poverty in Britain 1830-1914. London, Methuen. p. 111. See also: Stedman Jones, G. (1984) Outcast London. Harmondsworth, Penguin. p. 11.

38). Hansard. Vol. CXIX, 17th Feb. 1870. A view which was shared by such diverse figures as Rosamond Davenport Hill (DNB) and Lord Norton (1814-1905) a Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education (1858-1859) and the planner of the Saltley district of Birmingham. (DNB).

39). Stedman Jones. op. cit. pp. 15 and 269-270.

40). A good source for the social composition of an urban school board is Bingham, J. H. (1949) The Period of the Sheffield School Board 1870-1930. Sheffield, J. W. Northend. For the composition of a school board in a smaller town which was also dominated by professionals see: Bushby, D. W. (1975) 'Elementary Education in Bedford, 1868-1903'. The Publications of the Bedfordshire Historical Record Society. Vol. 54. pp. 9-107. The board's composition for 1897 is given on p. 69. See also: Wallas, M. (ed) (1940) Men and Ideas: Essays By Graham Wallas. London, George Allen and Unwin. p. 172.

41). PP. 1870. LIV. op. cit. pp. 161 and 174.

42). Article (19A) quoted in 'Instructions to Inspectors 1878' reproduced in PP. 1886. XXV. Royal Commission on the Working of the Elementary Education Acts. First Report. p. 494.

43). ibid. Evidence of Patrick Cumin. Q. 1622.

44). More recently in DES. Central Advisory Council for Education. (1967) Children in Their Primary Schools. Vol. 1. London, HMSO. paras. 506-507.

45). PP. 1886. XXV. op. cit. p. 495.

46). Sadler and Edwards. op. cit. p. 51.

47). See: Rubinstein, D. (1977) 'Socialization and the London School Board 1870-1904' in McCann, P. (ed) Popular Education and Socialization in the Nineteenth Century. London, Methuen. pp. 234-235.

48). For the spatial distribution of social class divisions and their effects on schooling see: Marsden, W. E. (1977) 'Social environment, School Attendance and Educational Achievement in a Merseyside Town 1870-1900' in ibid. pp. 193-230. On this theme see also the evidence of T. E. Powell, PP. 1887. XXX Royal Commission on the Working of the Elementary Education Acts. Third Report. Qs. 52,809. 52,812 and 52,895.

49). Philpott. op. cit. p. 40.

50). Gautrey. op. cit. p. 35. Lewis. op. cit. p. 301.

51). Christian, G. A. (1922) English Education From Within. London, Wallace Gandy. p. 19.

52). Ballard, P. B. (1937) Things I Cannot Forget. London, University of London Press. pp. 66-67.

53). Johnson, R. (1981) 'Unit 1. Education and Popular Politics'. E353 Society, Education and the State. Milton Keynes, Open University Press. p. 27.

54). Gautrey. op. cit. p. 116. Maclure (1970) op. cit. pp. 41-42.

55). Christian. op. cit. pp. 19-20.

56). Others included Thomas Gautrey who became secretary of the MBTA, Marshall Jackman who became an LCC Inspector and who organized a union for Inspectors and F. H. Spencer, a former researcher for the Webbs who was made Chief Inspector for the LCC and subsequently an HMI.

57). Runciman, J. (1887) Schools and Scholars. London, Chatto and Windus. pp. 245-246.

58). ibid. p. 246.

59). ibid. p. 248. For Lombroso see: Gould, S. J. (1984) The Mismeasure of Man. Harmondsworth, Penguin. pp. 122-135.

60). Runciman. op. cit. p. 249.

61). ibid.

62). For the riot see: Thompson, E. P. (1977) William Morris. London, Merlin. pp. 406-411. and Stedman Jones. op. cit. pp. 291-296.

63). Runciman. op. cit. pp. 258-259.

64). Gautrey. op. cit. p. 117.

65). Journal of Education. Vol. XXI. March. 1905. p. 203.

66). See Robertson, A. B. (1972) 'Children, Teachers and Society: the Over-Pressure Controversy 1880-1886'. British Journal of Educational Studies. Vol. XX. No. 3. pp. 315-323.

67). Sutherland (1973) op. cit. p. 245.

68). Dr James Crichton-Browne (1840-1938) DNB

69). Quoted in Sutherland. op. cit. p. 255.

70). Robertson. op. cit. p. 320.

71). Simon, B. (1978) 'Classification and Streaming: A Study of Grouping in English Schools, 1860-1960' in Simon, B. Intelligence, Psychology and Education. London, Lawrence and Wishart. p. 204.

72). Quoted in Sutherland. op. cit. pp. 247 and 249.

73). Appendix CLXXI. The Memorial of the Executive Committee of the National Union of Elementary Teachers. PP. XXXVI. 1888. Royal Commission on the Working of the Elementary Education Acts. p. 480.

74). Sutherland. op. cit. p. 341.

75). Evidence of Miss Whittenbury. PP. XXIX. 1887. Royal Commission on the Working of the Elementary Education Acts. Second Report. Q. 15,571.

76). ibid. Q. 15,582.

77). Evidence of Robert Wild. ibid. Q. 13,703.

78). ibid. Q. 13,856.

79). PP. XXIX. 1887. op.cit. Q. 15,570.

80). Evidence of Miss Constance Fox. PP. XXX. 1887. op. cit. Q. 51,667.

81). ibid. Q. 51,580.

82). Evidence of Alfred Bourne. PP. XXV. 1886. op. cit. Q. 10,048.

83). ibid. Q. 10,049

84). ibid. Q. 10,050. See also his reply to Q. 9881.

85). Evidence of Mr Richard Balchin. PP. XXX. 1887. op. cit. Q. 51,713.

86). ibid. Q. 51,745.

87). ibid.

88). He denounced the Code in typical industrial training fashion, holding that its aim was that of 'the counting-house and not [...] the workshop and factory'. ibid. Q. 51,746.

89). Marvin. (ed) op. cit. p. 331. The Code of 1871 abolished the restriction applied to the grant that only such children should receive elementary education. Elementary education was defined in section 3 of the Act of 1870 as that which took place in a school the fees of which did not excede 9d per week.

90). ibid. pp. 162-163.

91). ibid. p. 210.

92). ibid. p. 178. However, as R. Fitzgibbon Young argued in his appendix to the Spens Report, even with respect to secondary schooling Arnold's notion of a liberal education had already been undermined by among other things the demand for *techniciens* and specialists. Board of Education (1938) op. cit. Appendix II pp. 403-414.

93). PP. XXIX. 1887. Q. 13,805. Wild's school, a 6d per week one, catered for the respectable. Q. 13,570.

94). Evidence of Sir Henry Enfield Roscoe. PP. XXX. 1887. op. cit. Q. 55,813. Roscoe was a parliamentary leader of the NAPTSE. See note 71. Chapter 2.

95). PP. 1888. XXXV. Royal Commission on the Working of the Elementary Education Acts. Final Report. p. 113.

96). ibid. p. 214.

97). ibid.

98). ibid. p. 216.

99). ibid.

100). ibid.

101). ibid. p. 217.

102). Evidence of Sir Philip Magnus. PP. XXIX. 1887. op.cit. Qs. 28,815 and 28,605. This was quoted approvingly by the Majority in PP. 1888. XXXV. op. cit. p. 154.

103). Sir John Lubbock (1834-1913) 'banker, man of science and author'. A Liberal M.P. a member of the 'X' club and a member of the Devonshire Commission. DNB. He was also the treasurer of the NAPTSE. Sir Bernhard Samuelson (1820-1905) was the epitome of the Victorian self-made man. He left school at the age of fourteen and by 1872 had turned Banbury into the world centre for the production of agricultural reapers. He 'studied for himself the construction of blast furnaces' and built them at Middlesborough and Newport. A Liberal MP., and a Home-Ruler, he chaired the Royal Commission on Technical Instruction, all the Commissioners of which joined the NAPTSE.

104). PP. 1888. XXXV. op. cit. p. 248.

105). ibid. p. 305.

Chapter 5

THE FROEBEL MOVEMENT IN THE EARLY 1880's.

1.0 Introduction.

In the previous chapter, some aspects of the condition of elementary schooling in the 1880's were outlined in an effort to identify those conditions which were unfavourable and those which were favourable to the implementation of the Froebelian pedagogy. In this chapter the focus shifts to the Froebel movement itself and an assessment will be made of the extent to which it had secured an institutional base by the 1880's. The sector of private schooling is considered first as this was the area in which, as was noted in chapter 1, the Froebelian pedagogy first took root. This was due to the fact that in the period when state control over the elementary school curriculum was at its greatest, the private sector was the most receptive to new pedagogies. Provided that it could survive the vagaries of the market, a pedagogy such as that advocated by the Froebelians could put down institutional roots. Little is known about the diverse area of private schooling during the Nineteenth Century. Beyond the gaze of the state and its agents, the inspectorate, few details of the extent and organization of private schooling are known. For this reason, the section which follows on the Froebel movement and private schooling is necessarily descriptive as it seeks to provide as much tangible evidence about these schools as could be found.

Reliance on the market, however, proved to be a highly unsatisfactory way of organizing schools and this was particularly the case for the

kindergarten which differed in so many ways from most other middle and upper class schooling. By the 1880's, therefore, many Froebelians looked towards the state to implement their pedagogy and it is their strategies which are considered in the next section of this chapter. Attention is also paid to the way in which the response of the state in the form of the Education Department, had the effect of opening divisions within the ranks of the Froebel movement over how best to move forward. Finally, the Cross Commission is returned to in order to illustrate and evaluate the forces within the central and local state which were favourable to the Froebelian demands during the 1880's. This will provide further supporting evidence for the claims made in chapter 3 regarding the social basis of the Froebelian ideology.

2.0 The Sphere of Private Schooling.

Some idea of the extent to which the Froebelian pedagogy had entered private institutions by the 1880s may be gained from a brief survey of the more well known examples of Froebel inspired schools. Before commencing that task it is necessary to say a little about the hidden world of the Nineteenth Century private school. For a child of an upper or middle class family, until the 1880's, the most typical place for its education to begin was in its own home. It was in order to place home education on a theoretical basis and one which stressed the importance of 'playful methods' that the Edgeworths, for example, wrote their Practical Education.(1) With the gradual discontinuation of the practice of home education the private preparatory schools benefitted but Archer's suggestion in his pioneering history of secondary schooling, that the kindergartens displaced the private preparatory schools is difficult to

sustain.(2) This is because there were, at any one time, only ever a few privately owned kindergartens many of which were not recognised by the Froebel Society.(3) In 1907, for instance, there were in existence only thirty three kindergartens which were approved by the Froebel Society.(4) That private schools existed which offered similar 'playful methods' to those of the Froebelian kindergartens, is beyond doubt although their number is difficult to determine. At one such school, Miss Wüstney's at South Kensington, for example, play methods were observed in the 1880s. There, a game called 'Our Solar System' was played; a description of which stated that:

> A boy big for his age, and with a radiant face, represented the sun. He held a high pole in his hand at the top of which silk ribbons were fixed, of different lengths, to represent the relative distances of the planets from the sun. In reply to the mistress's question as to which planet was the nearest, all responded at once "Mercury", and the happy throng of about thirty or forty children sang a verse descriptive of the planet.(5)

Given that among the numerous 'commercial academies', 'Ladies Seminaries' and 'Ladies Colleges' (6) such methods were not entirely unknown, the brass plate outside the Froebel movement approved kindergarten was only one among many and its methods could have been, and often were, pirated.(7)

Tessa Blackstone has argued that the kindergarten appealed specifically to the section of the market constituted by the radical, intellectual sectors of the middle classes, partly:

> because it attempted to produce a quasi-scientific formula for the teaching of young children, based on knowledge, however incoherent, of the child's development.(8)

Her argument is persuasive but such evidence as has been found tends to point to the use of play rather than a quasi-scientific formula as the decisive factor in securing parental support.(9) Whatever was the case, the private kindergartens were faced by stiff competition and some, like one at St Leonards-on-Sea, chose to specialize. There, the Froebel House Kindergarten and Training College, advertised that 'Colonial and Indian children' were specially cared for.(10)

2.1 Private Kindergartens Approved by the Froebel Society.

As has been noted, evidence regarding the private kindergartens is notoriously difficult to uncover. The following decriptions of private kindergartens are therefore, derived from the most discussed examples in the secondary sources. They are not, by any means, claimed to be a representative sample but they nevertheless provide some evidence of the distribution of private kindergartens and the difficulties which they faced.

With regard to the market for the kindergarten, the 1880's began rather inauspiciously. In 1879, the Committee of the Froebel Society had opened a kindergarten and training college at Tavistock Place in London and it had appointed Caroline Bishop as its principal.(11) However, in 1883 the Journal of Education reported the closure of the kindergarten noting that it never attracted more than twenty five children and that:

> The respectable middle class English parent who lives in Bloomsbury hardly yet knows the name of Froebel.(12)

The students, who were at Tavistock Place were transferred to the Skinner Street training college in Bishopgate. This college had been established by the Teachers' Training and Registration Society in 1878 and it was intended to be a training college for students intending to teach in middle and higher schools for girls. The Skinner Street College began with four students. By 1885 the number had grown to fifty three and, in the same year, the college moved to Fitzroy Square where it was given the name of the Maria Grey Training College and under this name was to become an important Froebelian centre.(13)

In the meantime, Caroline Bishop, after spending two years in Berlin, opened a kindergarten at 109, Hagley Road in Birmingham. This subsequently became the Edgbaston Training College.(14) In Manchester, a kindergarten had been opened as early as 1857 by Miss Barton a former pupil of Bertha Ronge. One of the staff at this kindergarten, a German named Miss Anna Snell, opened the Manchester Kindergarten Training College which subsequently became the Mather Training College.(15)

In London in 1883, Miss Fanny Franks (1838-1920) took over a private school which, as the Camden House School, she ran on Froebelian lines. Franks had been drawn to study the kindergarten system after attending Professor Payne's lectures on Froebel. At the first examination run by the Froebel Society in 1876, she gained a first class certificate and she became a well known figure in the Froebel movement partly as result of the prestige of her school.(16) The children who attended her school were described as being the offspring of local, 'professional, literary and

artistic people'.(17) Much emphasis was placed in the school on artistic activities. A member of the Council of the Froebel Society, Mrs Curwen, taught music at the school by her own method (18) while Ebenezer Cooke (1837-1913) taught drawing, painting and nature study at the Camden house School. Cooke, who had been taught by Ruskin and Rossetti, was to play a major role in the transformation of both the way that art was taught in the kindergarten and the principles of teaching art to young children generally.(19)

At Bedford, which was described by the local paper,with some justification, as an 'educational centre',(20) a training college and kindergarten were begun in 1882, by 'a few persons in Bedford, interested in education', who had formed a limited liability company which was chaired by Mr J. S. Philpotts, the head of Bedford Grammar School.(21) The first head of the college was a Miss Sim who had been trained at the Home and Colonial College in London. She was succeeded as principal in 1895, by Miss Amy Walmsley who, after being trained by Madame Michaelis at Croydon, had taught at a GPDST school in Sheffield and the training department of Sheffield University.(22) Walmsley became the sole director of the company which ran the college in 1901 by buying out the other directors.(23)

At the turn of the century, in addition to the training college there were two kindergartens in Bedford; the second was added by Walmsley in 1896. The former contained, in 1901, one hundred and thirty five children and the latter, forty seven students. However the precarious existence of schools which were solely reliant on market forces for their income is illustrated by the fact that when the local grammar school opened a

preparatory department in order to prepare pupils more adequately for their later studies, the number of children in one of the kindergartens fell from one hundred and twenty in 1894 to sixty nine in 1901.(24) Commenting on this development, in 1895, Mr R. E. Mitcheson, an Assistant Commissioner for the Royal Commission on Secondary Education (Bryce) wrote that:

> The ideal of the Bedford Kindergarten is that education throughout should follow Kindergarten methods but for this the educational world is not yet ripe.(25)

The report of the HMI for 1902 on the Bedford kindergarten and training college also highlighted a situation which was common in many private schools. The inspectors found that there were not enough staff and that the accomodation was insufficient.(26)

In 1888 a former pupil of Miss Sim became the director of the kindergarten in a venture entitled the Sutton Kindergarten Company but this soon collapsed.(27) A more successful kindergarten enterprise, however, was begun at Croydon in 1875. This had as director of its kindergarten the German leader of the Froebel movement, Madame Emilie Michaelis. This company was incorporated as a limited liability company in 1880, the first kindergarten company to be owned in this way.(28)

2.3 Kindergarten and Secondary Schools for Girls.

The limited liability company was also the form of ownership adopted by the promoters of girls' secondary schools. Of these, the Girls' Public Day School Company was the most successful and by 1890 it had established thirty four schools.(29) The income of these schools was derived solely from fees and as a dividend was paid to shareholders, these fees were

relatively high. In the gradations of social class, in London at least, these schools occupied a position below the public schools but above the 'lesser endowed' or grammar schools.(30)

Frequently these proprietary schools aimed at a particular sector of the market. In the case of the Girls' Public Day School Company,the sector that it aimed to cater for most is self explanatory but by insisting on undenominational religious teaching its founders made their schools particularly attractive to the parents of Jewish and Nonconformist girls.(31) Another significant feature of these schools was their organization into three departments. As a result of pressure from Emily Shirreff, whenever possible the first of these departments, known as the preparatory department, was to include a kindergarten.(32)

This was already the practice at the Cheltenham Ladies' Colllege, where a kindergarten containing twenty five children had been opened in 1876 in Dorothea Beale's drawing room.(33) Like the schools of the Girls' Public Day School Company, the Cheltenham Ladies' College trained girls' for teaching and for kindergarten teaching in particular.

This provision of teacher training had the effect that the kindergartens attached to the girls' secondary schools, were there primarily as practising institutions and in this they differed from the smaller private kindergartens which had no training department.(34) While the question of training in the kindergarten system is not the main concern of this chapter it is nevertheless worth mentioning that it is hard to grasp nature of the close relation between the 'middle class', girls' schools and the kindergarten without referring to the role of the latter in preparing girls for a career which was regarded as suitable for their class.

While the kindergarten was of benefit to the new high schools, E. R. Murray, the author of an 'official' history of the Froebel movement, noted the value of these schools to the Froebel movement. These girls' schools were a new field for the 'kindergarten seed' and while payment by results dominated the elementary schools, they were, moreover, a field which was, in her view, 'more fruitful than the elementary school could possibly be'.(35)

3.0 The Froebel Movement and the Elementary Schools: The Mundella Deputation.

While the establishment of the girls' high schools opened up a new institutional space for the Froebel movement many sought the adoption of the kindergarten system by the state schools. One of the first attempts made by the Froebel movement, in the 1880's, to secure the implementation of the kindergarten system within the elementary schools took the form of a deputation to the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education, Anthony J. Mundella (1825-1897). Politically, Mundella was a Radical. An MP. for Sheffield from 1868 to 1897, his, 'whole career was devoted to strengthening the alliance between the Liberal Party and organized labour'.(36) In his business life, he was a hosiery manufacturer in Nottingham. His firm had a branch in Germany at Chemnitz and during the course of visits to it, Mundella became familiar with German technical education and with the Herbartian system of teaching which his friend and business associate, Henry Felkin, brought to the attention of English audiences.(37) Mundella's involvement in the politics of education through support for technical education and the Nonconformist cause, made him an archetypal modernizer. When therefore, following Gladstone's famous

Midlothian campaign, the Liberals took office in 1880 many, hoping for reform in education, were encouraged by the appointment of Mundella as Vice-President.

Most of the hopes of the organized teachers were riding on the possible reform, if not the abolition, of the payment by results system. These hopes, perhaps, were raised higher by the anouncement that the unprecedented step had been taken of establishing a Code Committee to revise the New Code of 1871.(38) This Committee, which was set up in 1881, consisted of Mundella, Patrick Cumin, the Secretary to the Education Department, the Department's Assistant Secretary and three HMIs. It was created in order to receive opinion on a draft of the Code which, for the first time, had been published.(39) Among those organizations which gave evidence to the Committee was the NUET. The executive of the union met with Mundella and the Education Department's *de jure* head, the Lord President of the Council, Lord Spencer, in December 1881.(40) The NUET delegation asked for changes in the Code which would have given teachers more freedom and removed some of the pressure imposed upon them by the stress laid upon the percentage of passes obtained in the calculation of the grant. When the Code appeared in 1882, however, few of the teachers' demands had been met. G.A.Christian , who was on the NUET delegation, felt that it was Cumin and not Mundella who had the most power to determine the contents of the Code and that he was not disposed to allow the Code to be subjected to major revision.(41)

Given that the NUET, the most powerful of the teachers' organizations, had achieved little, it was unlikely that any other organization which presented demands, the satisfaction of which depended greatly on the

abolition of payment by results, could be successful either. Nevertheless, in July 1881, the Froebel Society and the Manchester Kindergarten Association formed a delegation which was received by Mundella. Its purpose was to:

> urge that Her Majesty's Inspectors be directed to allow as teaching suitable to the age of the children under seven that which is known as kindergarten training, and to employ in 'the examination of the infants in any properly constituted kindergarten, a method of ascertaining results approved by capable exponents of the system.(42)

This audacious and somewhat presumptuous demand, amounted to a take-over bid for infant schooling. It is therefore, not altogether surprising that it was rejected. However, Mundella was not entirely unsympathetic to the Froebel movement. He was, after all, a Vice-President of the British and Foreign School Society, which ran the Stockwell Training College where, from 1874, Eleonore Heerwart had run a training course in kindergarten methods. Moreover, the Secretary of the British and Foreign, Alfred Bourne (1832-1908), was a prominent member of the Froebel Society and he had accompanied Emily Shirreff on the deputation.(43) In later years, Mundella, during the course of chairing an annual meeting of the Froebel Society, declared himself to be 'an out-and-out Froebelian'.(44) Even if the possibility that he was merely attempting to ingratiate himself with his audience is discounted, there was little that a Vice-President alone could do which would have satisfied the demand of the Froebel Society,

however much he was sympathetic to its objects. This was even more the case if, as was likely, that it would have led to increased expenditure.

3.1 The Kindergarten in the Elementary Schools.

Nevertheless, both HMI and the Education Department, because some elementary schools adopted kindergarten practices, had to respond to the fact of the kindergarten or, as the following instance demonstrates, what it was thought to be. The elementary schools of Berkshire, Wiltshire, Surrey and Oxfordshire were, in the early 1880's, inspected by the Rev. C. D. Du Port. In his report for 1880, Du Port recorded that:

> a wise proportion of *Kindergarten* work is done. And in many of the schools in which it is not actually professed by name, the *Kindergarten* principle is manifestly traceable in many of the departments of instruction.(45)

The phrase 'the kindergarten principle', for Du Port signified 'a child's garden of delight'. However, when he discussed the practical realisation of this concept, Du Port, showed himself to be unfamiliar with the mainstream Froebelian view such as their position regarding the teaching of reading. For him, the kindergarten way to teach reading was through phonetics and not merely the contents of 'half-a-dozen reading cards, composed of uninteresting and aimless sentences'.(46) Thus Du Port equated the kindergarten with pleasurable methods of teaching and learning for if, he wrote, children learned to read by means of combining sounds then the 'toil of learning to read English' would be made 'a positive pleasure'.(47) While the advocacy of pleasure in learning was consistent

with the Froebelian view, teaching children, of the age to which Du Port referred, to read was not.

As an HMI, Du Port's role was to assess the working of the system and to suggest ways in which it might be improved, not to work for its abolition or its replacement by another 'pedagogic system'. Significantly, Du Port, while grasping the kindergarten principle, showed little enthusiasm for 'Kindergarten Work'. This was the title given to work with Froebel's gifts and occupations which had entered some schools by the 1880s. Frequently, such work was assimilated into the dominant 'drill' method with the result that work with the cubes was carried out by placing a cube in front of, as many as sixty, children, which was then manipulated only on the order of the teacher. Such activities were commonly carried on with the infants arranged in tiered rows of seats and desks known as a gallery.(48) Drawing sequences on squared slates, as laid down by Froebel, were also executed in these conditions. As a qualified Froebelian, who taught in elementary schools wrote:

> Imagine sixty children, aged 4-5 devoting two lessons weekly, forty-five minutes each, to four simple detached strokes... We let them draw straight strokes till, from sheer weariness, the strokes became, at the bottom of the slate, more and more crooked.(49)

What happened, according to the same writer, was that instead of Froebel's principles entering the elementary schools, his:

> little bricks and cubes, paper squares and paper mats, sticks and laths, prickers and pads, and these became a medium for military drill.(50)

Given the conditions of many elementary schools the kindergarten could hardly have been taught in any other way. Routinization is always a threat to pedagogies which lay particular stress on the interaction of teacher and taught but any such built-in tendencies were magnified by large classes and by the absence of a classroom for each standard.

The conditions in a National School where all the children were taught in one room were described by its headteacher who appeared before the Cross Commission. In her school, the older children tended to stop work to look at the infants engaged in brick building and threading beads. The teacher was relatively unconcerned at the disruption caused by the kindergarten activities for as she told the Commission:

> I will not believe in children learning and its being made a drudgery; I like to hear them laugh.(51)

Nevetheless, there were obvious situational constraints upon the extent to which, in these conditions, school work could be made enjoyable.

3.2 The Official View of the Kindergarten.

In addition to the effects of the material conditions existing in the schools, the way that the kindergarten was appropriated was also due to the way it was pronounced upon by the Education Department. In 1882, in a circular to inspectors the Department warned that:

> It should be borne in mind that it is of little service to adopt the "gifts" and mechanical occupations of the *Kindergarten* unless they are so used as to furnish real training in accuracy of hand and eye, in intelligence and obedience.(52)

Although this view of the kindergarten appears to be opposed to Du Port's 'kindergarten principle', as will be seen, there was a faction within the Froebel movement which advocated the kindergarten as a superior means of 'hand and eye' training and which held a set of psychological assumptions similar to those which are evident in the Education Department's circular. The Department cannot, therefore, be held to be solely culpable for its mechanistic interpretation of the kindergarten. Nevertheless, the template which governed the way in which the kindergarten entered schools was the elementary school Code which was laid down by the Education Department.

Faced with the prospect of schools adopting aspects of the kindergarten, the Department sought to regulate its reception through further instructions to inspectors. Circular 228, for example, which was issued in 1883, set out the conditions which had to be met before infant schools and departments could be awarded a merit grant. The merit grant had first appeared in the New Code of 1882 and it may be regarded as an attempt by Mundella to raise the quality of infant schooling in line with his reformist educational objectives. The fact that in attempting to do so, he increased the pressure on inefficient schools, the majority of which were denominational, did not pass unnoticed and illustrates the power that the religious question possessed to frustrate reformist intentions.(53)

Under the new conditions for the receipt of a merit grant, a school or department judged as fair by the inspector was entitled to a grant of two shillings for each pupil in average attendance. Schools assessed as good received four shillings and those which were held to be excellent were

given a grant of six shillings.(54) In order to qualify for the merit grant, schools had to make provision for:

> (1) suitable instruction in the elementary subjects, (2) simple lessons on objects and the phenomena of nature and common life and (3) appropriate and varied occupations.(55)

It was explained by the Department in Circular 228, that the elementary subjects consisted of reading, writing and arithmetic and that the third condition for the grant could be met by the provision of 'the exercises usually known as those of the Kindergarten'.(56)

In the view of Joshua Fitch, the changes made by Mundella gave to the Code a 'greater freedom and elasticity' and 'for the first time', he claimed, it recognized 'the importance of the Froebelian system in the infant schools'.(57) The question of why Fitch should see this as significant will be held over until the discussion of professionalization and training. However, while some Froebelians, as will be seen, welcomed the granting of official approval to their system by the Education Department many did not. One prominent Froebelian, William Herford from Manchester, likened it to:

> the little drops of a sweet tasting fluid which came down from certain trees at various seasons of the year, but which was not a moisture such as the plants underneath enjoyed, or the cultivators of those plants entirely welcomed.(58)

3.3 The View of the Inspectorate.

It is easy when considering the reaction of HMI to the Froebel system to find those who supported it as well as those who did not. The opinion of HMI Rev. Du Port who was sympathetic to Froebelian aims has been noted already and there were others in the inspectorate who also defended the kindergarten. Among these were T. G. Rooper (1847-1903),(59) and Henry Holman who became Professor of Education at Aberystwyth.(60) Nevertheless, what is significant is not how many inspectors were for or against the introduction of the kindergarten into the elementary schools at any given moment but who among the most powerful of the inspectors supported or opposed it. Of all the HMI in the late Nineteenth Century, Joshua Fitch was perhaps the most important in determining the policy of the Education Department. He was, according to Sadler, 'qualified by an almost unique experience to advise the Education Department'(61) and the NUET regarded him as the principal architect of the Code of 1882.(62)

Fitch made his views on the kindergarten known to a much wider audience than the readers of the annual reports of the Committee of Council. In his widely utilised Lectures On Teaching, which was first published in 1881, Fitch collected together the lectures which he had given in 1880 under the auspices of the Cambridge Teachers Training Syndicate. Regarding the education of young children, Fitch - in common with most Froebelians - adhered to the dominant theory of learning of his time which held that the mind consisted of innate 'faculties' which required, as he put it, 'active and systematic exercise'.(63) It is in the context of this theory that Fitch regarded Froebel's work as the most systematic attempt to apply the principle of the necessity for sense training.(64) In other words Fitch 'read' Froebel through the lens of the faculty psychology

psychology and this reading sought to identify the sense or the faculty trained by each of the activities. Thus, from the 'gifts', according to Fitch, children were able to learn, '...obedience, fixed attention, accuracy of eye, [and] steadiness of hand'.(65) On the positive side, Fitch thought that the Froebelian pedagogy increased the happiness of little children and helped to solve the problem of 'how to fill up their time at school' while at the same time, keeping them 'under discipline'. It was also able to occupy children, in his view, without 'giving them unpleasant associations with the thought of learning'(66) and in the kindergarten system:

> ... all these lessons are learned in the best of all ways; without being considered as lessons; not indeed in the shape of lessons at all, but rather as so much play.(67)

Despite these favourable remarks, Fitch was, on the whole, critical of the Froebelian pedagogy. In the first place, he observed that for the system to work well, teachers were required who had faith in it and possessed a 'special aptitude and enthusiasm for it'.(68) Secondly, Fitch was critical of the 'thorough going' kindergartener who wanted to keep children:

> up to the age of six or seven engaged all day in straw-plaiting or paper folding, in dancing round a maypole, and in singing and reciting childish verses.(69)

In addition, Fitch argued that when the children could be reading, in the kindergarten they were kept looking at diagrams and pictures. In his view, children knew that when they came to school they came to learn and that they were 'not being well prepared for the serious work of school or of after life' if all they had to do in school looked like play.(70)

That Fitch in his lectures contradicted himself with regard to play methods in school is evident from his remarks in praise of such methods quoted above however, his overall stance, which he dressed in the language of faculty psychology, was that school life was too short to be spent exercising a faculty, once it had been 'awakened'. Once children had learned to observe, for example, then they were ready to 'work on some of the practical problems of life' such as reading. Thus, while Fitch did not dismiss the Froebelian pedagogy out of hand, he thought that it would only have value 'if judiciously incorporated with other forms of early instruction' in the schooling of children below the age of seven. It had, in other words, a certain utility as a method but not as a holistic approach to the schooling of young children.

The view of Fitch corresponded to the practice of the Education Department during the 1880's and early 1890's; the Froebelian pedagogy was not allowed to supersede the traditional emphasis on the formal teaching of the Three R's but elements of it could be incorporated into the practice of the infant schools.

4.0 Froebelian Strategies For Changing The Elementary Schools.

Official recognition of the type contained in Circular 228 drew a range of responses from Froebelians. Some sought the incorporation of elements of the kindergarten into elementary school practice while others wanted nothing less than its wholesale adoption. While the Froebel movement debated the best strategy to follow, Mundella's New Code was subjected to a wide-ranging attack which was referred to in the previous chapter under the heading of the 'over-pressure controversy'.(71) For present purposes, the significance of this upsurge in criticism of the entire

system of payment-by-results was that it strengthened the position of those who rejected the strategy of incorporation.

This rejectionist position which fought against the liquidation of the oppositional elements in the Froebelian programme was held by Eleonore Heerwart who expressed it at a conference held in 1883 to discuss the introduction of the kindergarten into the elementary schools. Heerwart was unyielding on the Froebelian position that no book learning should take place before the age of seven.(72)

This, she was told by Fitch and another HMI, was hopeless as the Education Department could not be induced to postpone the First Standard for a year. They also argued that certain features of the kindergarten, like the occupations which were adapted mainly to German rural life, should be revised in order to make them fit more closely the different conditions of life in London.(73) Under attack from these revisionists were action songs about pre-industrial occupations such as 'The Charcoal Burner's Hut', 'The Wheelwright' and 'The Joiner'(74) but this criticism also contained an anti-German strand as was evident in the call of the Journal of Education for more 'English songs and games'.(75)

Revisionist Froebelians like Herbert Courthope Bowen (1847-1909) went as far in the direction of appeasing Fitch as to suggest that Froebel's songs ought to be dropped in favour of ones which reflected their own physical and social environment. For children, he declared:

> actual life and actual nature around them - or which can be placed close to them - are the Froebelian means of education.(76)

This line was to emerge much more strongly in the 1890's but, as then, there is no reason to suppose that the Education Department was more favourable to this conception than to the gifts and occupations.

4.1 The International Health Exhibition of 1884.

One of the best records from the 1880's of Froebelian debates over strategy is that associated with a conference on education held in conjunction with the International Health Exhibition of 1884. This conference was held at South Kensington in the newly completed buildings of the Central Institution of the City and Guilds Institute. This example of a 'modern' institute of technical and scientific education was a forerunner of the modernizers greatest monument, Imperial College. However, in 1884 due to the scale of the conference the Institution was popularly referred to as 'the Healtheries'. Discussion of the education of the young child at the conference may be organized under two main headings: teaching and the infant schools and the kindergarten.

The main focus of the discussion on infant schools was the new Code. In a paper entitled 'Infants' Schools Under the Code of 1884' Alfred Bourne argued that the increase in the number of children in schools who were under six years old together with the 'large amount of freedom' provided by the Code, created suitable conditions for 'those who approve of the kindergarten system to put forward its claims to attention'.(77) As evidence for his view that the Code allowed the introduction of the kindergarten in schools which accepted children who were below the age of Standard 1, Bourne cited Circular 228 and the passage in the Revised Instructions to Inspectors which stated in relation to the teaching of the three Rs to young children that:

> Your attention is specially directed in the Code to the results of instruction in reading, writing and arithmetic. The object of examining very young children in these subjects is to ascertain whether they are making such progress that there is a reasonable prospect of their passing the examination when they reach the standard, or the school for older children. In doing this you will not require or lay down any standard or scheme to be uniformly observed, but will report upon the plan which is adopted by the managers, and upon the success with which it is carried out.(78)

In addition to this statement of policy, Bourne presented two Inspector's Reports which were favourable to the kindergarten. One of the Reports had been written on the kindergarten which was attached to Stockwell Training College by Joshuah Fitch. A somewhat unreliable ally of the Froebelians, Fitch's views on infant training, which he had outlined in his Lectures On Teaching, were also quoted approvingly by Bourne early in his paper. Thus adding weight to the view that Bourne was prepared to seek a compromise with the Education Department in order to gain a toehold in the elementary schools.

Notably, however, only one of the participants in the discussion, a Miss Moore who had been a Board School Manager, agreed with Bourne's optimistic reading of the conditions for the implementation of kindergarten practices.(79) The view of the majority was expressed by the Austrian political refugee, Adolf Sonnenschien who rejected Bourne's analysis and argued that 'thorough rational teaching in accordance with the principles

laid down in Froebel's course' was incompatible with the requirements of Standard 1.(80) He also observed that until the system of payment by results was utterly abandoned the evils from which elementary schooling suffered would not disappear.(81) Similar sentiments were expressed by a former pupil of David Stow, the pioneer of infant schooling, a Mr Langer. He pointed out that between the ages of three and a half and seven, children in infant schools were prepared for the examination at Standard 1 and that such a course did not lead to 'a life of happiness'.(82)

William Herford's contribution while echoing the criticisms made by others of giving young children 'instruction and bookwork' was also critical of some versions of the kindergarten. He particularly objected to the:

> introduction of a small box containing a limited quantity of strips of wood and a certain number of small balls of cotton and worsted, and needles with the points carefully blunted, and a variety of things of that sort, and to children being at distant intervals in the week set to do a variety of things; and to its being said that the kindergarten was introduced into that school.(83)

While Bourne was seeking the incorporation of just this sort of thing into the elementary schools, Herford aimed at the introduction of 'the kindergarten principle' which he defined as a focus on the ends, rather than the means, of schooling so that each pupil would:

> afterwards be able to use their powers upon the very much larger scale, amongst the infinitely varied materials, which the world offered to them.(84)

Such an approach as that of Herford was unlikely to appeal to those like Bourne who were seeking to apply rational models of problem solving in which the ends were limited but clearly defined and who were prepared to accept the routinisation of school work.

A rejection of the existing forms and practices of schooling of the young and the construction of alternatives derived from those forms and practices was evident in the paper given by Adelaide Manning, the Froebel Society's Secretary. In her view, the alternative to school took the concrete form of the home thus the kindergarten should be, she declared:

> a supplement to home life, not (...) a substitute for it, except in the case of those neglected children in whose homes bad influences prevail.(85)

As will be seen in chapter 10, the exceptions, in the eyes of many in the Froebel movement began, in the late 1890's, to outstrip the rule but for Manning in 1884 Infant schools were inappropriate for young children as:

> notwithstanding improvements, the discipline is, on account of the numbers, very rigid for such young children. They can receive little of the motherly care that they so much need; vivacity is almost necessarily discouraged. They have small scope for observation except in set object lessons, and not sufficient employment for their active hands (...) the Infant school seems to me by no means thoroughly adapted to secure the growth of infant faculties.(86)

In her view, the kindergarten ought to be the obverse of the infant school as she had described it but clearly the home, or specifically the middle

class home, was her ideal. In the kindergarten, argued Manning, there should be 'bodily activity of every kind, manual power, fancy, imitative action, and loving dependence leading to moral development'.(87) Teaching should not consist of direct instruction; instead 'handling and doing' would provide the basis for training and work should be pleasant as for 'little ones', merriment was as essential as fresh air.(88)

4.2 Froebelian Views of Obstacles to the Spread of the Kindergarten in Elementary Schools.

Arguably, the definition of the kindergarten adopted effected strategies for its implementation so that those who saw it as entirely oppositional to existing schooling sought the latter's replacement whereas those who saw it as only a partial alternative, tried to secure the incorporation of some of its practices into the elementary schools. Strategies to secure the implementation of the Froebelian pedagogy in the elementary schools also depended upon the view adopted of the obstacles to that implementation. However, there was little disagreement at the Health Exhibition Conference in the answers given to Manning's question, 'why have not Froebel's methods been more widely accepted and acted on in England?'(89) Bourne's answer, which excluded the effects of the Code, included:

> insufficient premises, insufficient staff, and a lack of appreciation on the part of teachers of the rational method of educating little children. Small classes, each with a capable and sympathetic teacher are expensive, yet they are essential to the study of individual

peculiarities and the adaptation of the training to each of the little ones.(90)

The reference to the individualization of teaching in Bourne's remarks was not especially common in the Froebel movement although it was in line with a later child-centred position. That aside, little of substance was added by other participants in the discussion to Bourne's list of constraints. Edwin Chadwick, once termed the 'best hated man in England',(91) criticised those managers who appointed as teachers, 'the cheapest persons that they could get'.(92) Rosamond Davenport Hill (1825-1902), a member of the London School Board, also thought that the 'want of good teachers' was responsible for the 'slow growth of the Kindergarten teaching'.(93) Thus the training of suitable teachers was identified by most in the leadership of the Froebel movement as a priority. As for Bourne's other constraints, such as insufficient premises and expense, few of the other contributors to the discussion demonstrated any familiarity with the conditions of most elementary schools and the social composition of their intake. (94) Consequently, and characteristically, there was no discussion of these material constraints

5.0 Froebelian Evidence on the Kindergarten to the Cross Commission.

This was not the case with the teachers who were in sympathy with the kindergarten and who gave evidence to the Cross Commission. The issue of infant schooling and the related issue of the suitability of the kindergarten were, at best, highly marginal to the main concerns of the Cross Commission. As a consequence, the number of witnesses who gave evidence on the infant school and those who gave evidence on the kindergarten was very small. Not however as small as Lylulph Stanley, the

leader of the Minority on the Commission maintained.(95) Among the Froebelians who appeared before the Commissioners, the most prominent was Alfred Bourne. He was examined at some length but not about the kindergarten. At the end of his evidence he stated that he was prepared to give evidence on the kindergarten but only if he should be chosen as part of a deputation from the Froebel Society.(96) This did not materialize and so his views on the kindergarten were not presented.(97)

Another witness close to the Froebel movement who appeared before Cross was Lydia Manley, the Mistress of Method at the Stockwell Training College who had trained at the Bishopgate Training College. In the course of her interrogation, Manley answered questions on the kindergarten but her responses were short to the point of being curt. Even when encouraged to expand her views on the kindergarten, she declined the opportunity. (98) At the College's kindergarten, she told the Commission, the pupils were:

> taught on Froebel's principles; they have the occupations and the games, and they have lessons on form and colour.(99)

The children, who entered the kindergarten at the age of three, were taught their letters which was contrary to Froebelian practice but this was done also by Miss Whittenbury, a witness on the infant school and the head of Sidney Road Board School, at Homerton. This school was a 1d a week school, the lowest fee which could be charged and consequently Miss Whittenbury's practice, as was discussed in the last chapter, was linked to what she felt was appropriate for young children, 'of poor labouring parents'. Thus, although she provided three and a half hours a week of 'kindergarten' for all the school except the First Standard, she

nonetheless felt that more 'marching and singing and less of the three R's' was desirable (100) and that the children under five:

> ought to have a great deal of Kindergarten, marching, and object lessons and conversational lessons, because the little children come from such poor homes that they do not seem to have any idea of home.(101)

The theme of the kindergarten as a remedy for what, more recently has been called 'cultural deprivation', was one which began to grow in intensity in the Froebel movement during the 1890's but Miss Whittenbury still adhered to the view that it was preferable that the kindergarten games be used alongside and not instead of, 'literary instruction'in the schooling of the under fives.(102)

5.1 The Kindergarten's Contrary Class Belonging.

At least two of those connected to the Froebel movement who gave evidence to the Cross Commission advocated the desirability of more 'practical' work in the schooling of the urban poor.(103) Barred from entering the elementary schools in the form that many Froebelians wished, the kindergarten was promoted by some as especially suited to the needs of the residuum. At the Greystoke Place Board School in London the School Board experimented with a scheme in which there was no 'direct literary teaching' in the first two classes.(104) The timetable was said by the Chief HMI, the Rev. T.W. Sharpe, to have been drawn up 'very much on kindergarten lines' (105) with 'games and kindergarten' (106) substituted for the three R's. This was unsurprising as the timetable was 'largely drawn up by Miss Davenport Hill' a member of the School Board who was a strong supporter of the Froebel movement.(107) In Sharpe's opinion,

which was one which resonated in Froebelian circles for the next two decades, baby rooms, organized as at Greystoke, were best suited to 'very poor neighbourhoods'.(108)

Evidence presented to the Cross Commission also reflected the other and more dominant aspect of Froebelian class connections: the association with the schooling of the middle class. In the following example that association was mediated through a training college to a working class school. This school was the Home and Colonial Society's one in Gray's Inn Road and to it were sent the children of Henry Williams, a jobbing printer, and the only one of the three 'representatives' of the working class who appeared before Cross to support Denominational schooling. The infant department of this school was used as a kindergarten practising school by students at the Home and Colonial Training College (109) and it charged 3d per week. The methods used were such, said Williams, that it was 'pleasurable to learn and most interesting'.(110) Additionally, Williams was attracted to the voluntary schools as the influence brought to bear 'upon the tone of the children' was better, in his opinion than in the Board schools.(111) In order to maintain that tone, the senior department of the school charged 6d which gave him, said Williams, the power to choose the associates of his children.(112)

One of the practising schools at Stockwell charged the maximum allowed under the Act of 1870, 9d a week. Despite the opening of a Board school nearby, which charged a lower fee children were not transferred to it from the Stockwell school. According to Alfred Bourne, the reason for this was that the 'higher stratum of the working classes' did not want their children to attend the same school as 'ragged children'.(113) Neither,

arguably, did the societies which ran these colleges want their students to practice in schools attended by the residuum. Despite this evidence of the association between the kindergarten and the middle class proving attractive to the respectable this does not appear to have been very widespread as is evidenced by the attempts of Froebelians to reorientate the kindergarten not towards the respectable but towards the residuum

5.2 Schooling For Happiness: The Kindergarten as the School of the Poor.

The most cogent arguments for the suitability of the kindergarten for the schooling of the urban poor were put by the Rev. Mark Wilks, a member of the London School Board and Chair of its School Management Committee. Like Stanley, who led the Cross Minority, Wilks' knowledge of London schools was little short of phenomenal. Wilks was a quintessential Progressive, not only in the sense of being attached to that party of Nonconformists and Liberals on the London School Board but in the wider sense which came to be used to describe varieties of Lib-Labism.(114) He was strongly opposed to payment by results and the teaching of religion in school. Almost as a corollary, he favoured the universal introduction of school boards and the introduction of free schooling. His radicalism, however, had limits; while he supported the provision of 'baby rooms', or what in London were called nurseries or crêches, for the under fives in 'really poor neighbourhoods' he felt that schools should not feed and clothe children as it opened the door 'to pauperism and fraud immediately'.(115)

Much of Wilks' evidence was concerned with London schools and their problems which were related to the presence within them of the urban poor. For the 'residuum', Wilks told the Commission, compulsion was not enough, a

sentiment in favour of education had to be created and in the case of the children, this meant making the schools attractive.(116) It was in this context, the need to 'moralize' the residuum, that Wilks enthusiasm for the kindergarten was situated. (117) Referring to the schooling of young children whom, he told the Commission, 'have no home life' and who 'never hear a conversation', Wilks declared:

> I do not want those children to be taught any thing except to use their hands, their eyes, their ears, and their voices. What we have to aim at is, to make those children happy...In an infant school the object of the teacher must be to make those children happy.(118)

The methods to achieve this object, could, said Wilks:

> 'be adopted from any manual of Kindergarten but the methods will all depend upon the buoyancy and cheerfulness of the young women who are using them'.(119)

This approach, which was undogmatic by Froebelian standards,was similar to that of Herford which was discussed earlier in this chapter. But Wilks, unlike Herford, outlined, in a highly concrete form, the conditions necessary for the implementation of the kindergarten in the elementary schools.

Firstly, he called for the reduction of class sizes to 30 pupils in average attendance to each assistant teacher. This would permit, Wilks suggested, the introduction of 'Kindergarten exercises, games and manual occupations'. He had seen, he told the Commission, small classes in existing private

'Kindergarten schools'. These contrasted greatly to the sight, which he had constantly seen in the infant schools of the London School Board, of:

> Eighty children packed on to a gallery and a teacher with a little box of cubes trying to show how these cubes can be made to represent various things or represent numbers.(120)

A second necessary condition identified by Wilks, after much guidance from Lyulph Stanley, was the provision of better trained teachers (121) and a third condition was the need to curtail the power of HMI to block the introduction of new methods.(122) Wilks' intimate knowledge of conditions in London elementary schools was, no doubt, the reason why he was able to identify these obstacles. Indeed, one of the main differences between Wilks' assessment of the obstacles to the kindergarten in the elementary school and that of most of the Froebelians at the Health Exhibition was, firstly, his familiarity with the state of elementary schools in London and secondly, his grasp of the political aspects of the question. The implementation of the kindergarten required political action to alter those material conditions which functioned as obstacles to it. Wilks, as a School Board politician of some experience understood this; most Froebelians either did not or if they did they chose not to express it.

6.0 The Kindergarten in the Report of the Cross Commission.

The contents of the Report of the Cross Commission were of considerable importance in providing politicians with the arguments for the modernization of schooling. Hence, what the Report had to say about the kindergarten was an indication of how likely it was that it would play a part in that modernization process. In the Final Reports of both the

Majority and the Minority on the Cross Commission, Wilks' version of the kindergarten was pushed into the background. The Majority had, in any case, very little to say about infant schools but it observed that:

> Much had been done in infant schools by means of the Kindergarten occupations, to educate the hand and the eye,[...] and its the subject of very general regret that boys from seven years old should lose all benefit of this training.(123)

This was in line with the attitude of the Education Department as was cited above. In order to make good this deficiency, the Majority recommended that the object lessons taught to infants should also be taught in the lower standards of the Senior Departments and schools.(124) This refrain, the introduction of infant school practices into the schooling of older children was to become, as will be seen, a familiar one but there are few grounds for believing that the Majority did other than take the line of the Education Department on this matter.

The Minority, in contrast and as might have been expected given its connections with the Liberals - the party of popular education , devoted more space in its recommendations to infant schooling than did the Majority. It defended the admission to school of children below the age of five on the grounds that it was convenient for poor parents and better for the children who, instead of the street, could experience 'warm bright rooms' in which they were 'animated by cheerful occupations'. In addition, and owing it was stressed to the employment of kindergarten methods, the children received 'valuable moral training in habits of tidiness, order and obedience'.(125) In this version of the purposes of schooling, the

objective of the moralisation of the urban poor was placed on a secular basis and the kindergarten, with its cheerful occupations, was thought to be the most appropriate instrument for that task.

With regard to the Code, as it effected infant schooling, the Minority welcomed the greater liberty granted to the schools by Mundella's Code as well as the introduction of 'simple lessons on objects and on the phenomena of nature and common life, and of appropriate and varied occupations'.(126) It called for 'still further liberty' and for the abandonment of 'direct literary instruction' in the schooling of infants below the ages of five or six. In line with this Froebelian theme, the Minority urged that:

> the work of the infant school should be mainly formative, and should guide the spontaneous activity of the child's nature.(127)

In addition, it offered its own evaluation of the kindergarten, stating that the occupations of 'Fröbel' were 'of the greatest value' but they should not be thought of as a subject but as 'a method and spirit'.(128)

Conclusion

This account of the Froebel movement in the 1880's has revealed a complex relation between the Froebel movement and the existing systems of schooling. It cannot be said that it had established a monopoly over the schooling of young children in the private sector. However, it did have associated with it a number of prestigous schools which were patronised by sections of the middle class. The support for these schools was, however, liable to evaporate in the event of the opening of a more fashionable rival. Thus the kindergartens which opened in association

with the girls' high schools were more financially stable and, as a consequence, they provided the Froebelians with a more secure basis on which to demonstrate the superiority of their pedagogy. Nevertheless, many Froebelian eyes were on the state regulated system of schooling. As a result, the Froebel movement in this period, as will be shown in the next chapter, was clearly more shaped than shaping by this encounter. The question of the Froebel movement's lack of power to change the state system from above was revealed in the episode of the delegation to Mundella discussed in the previous chapter. However, without a conception of the politics of education, without allies in other words, the Froebel movement had little chance of redressing that imbalance of power.

There has also been revealed not only competing definitions of the kindergarten within the Froebel movement and competing perspectives with regard to strategy but at least two possible options and alliances opened up to it by the growth of mass schooling and by the attempts of intellectuals attached to the industrial fraction of the power bloc to modernize the system of schooling. The first option was that of becoming a pedagogy specific to the urban poor; non-literary and moralising but, unlike the traditional pedagogy, this moralization was to be a happy experience and was not to be based on sectarian Biblical teaching. This was the line of the Cross Minority which, as has been seen, was motivated by a combination of the desire to protect and to moralize the children of the urban poor. This option had a number of consequences which bore upon the relation between the public and the private for the relative silence of the Cross Majority on the question of infant schools may be interpreted as its support for the view that the best place for the young child was

its home. The Minority, on the other hand, had few reservations about undermining the private sphere of the home of poor families. This trajectory became much more explicit towards the end of the 1890's, by which time the Froebel movement had undergone an internal transformation. The other space for the Froebel movement which opened at the end of the 1880's was connected to the first one, in as much as it was constructed in opposition to a liberal or Arnoldian conception of schooling. This was created by pressure for a more vocational schooling for the working class and it was concerned, mainly, with the transmission of industrial and domestic skills. This was responded to by the rise within the Froebel movement of the 'Hand and Eye' faction which is the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 5.

FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES.

1). Edgeworth, R. L. and Edgeworth, M. (1798) Practical Education. Two Vols. London, J. Johnson.

2). See: Archer, R. L. (1932) Secondary Education in the Nineteenth Century. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. p. 98. On the transition from home to school based education see: Musgrove, F. (1970) 'Middle-class Families and Schools, 1780-1880: Interaction and Exchange of Function Between Institutions' in Musgrave, P. W. (ed) Sociology, History and Education. London, Methuen. pp. 117-125. Musgrove says little about the schooling of young children.

3). Recognition was not a formal procedure. A kindergarten is held here to have been recognized if advertisements for it appeared in the Froebelian journals and its staff possessed Froebelian qualifications.

4). A 'Directory of Kindergartens and Training Colleges' was first published in Child Life. Vol. X. No. 37. 1908. p. 30. This list excluded kindergartens attached to high schools.

5). The Health Exhibition Literature. op. cit. p. 88.

6). For a description see: Webb, B. (1915a) op. cit. p. 12. and Hughes (1978a) op. cit. pp. 167-175.

7). A man named Barnes got nineteen months with hard labour in 1887 for 'fleecing teachers at the rate of £1,000 a year' and issuing bogus Froebel Certificates. Journal of Education. Vol. IX. August. pp. 341-342.

8). Blackstone, T. (1971) A Fair Start. London, Allen Lane. p. 26.

9). The Health Exhibition Literature. op. cit. p. 87.

10). Journal of Education. Vol. XXII. Jan. 1900. (Advertisement).

11). Last. op. cit. p. 4. Woodham Smith. (1952) op. cit. p. 53.

12). Journal of Education. Vol. V. August. p. 265. This kindergarten had been run by Esther Lawrence who subsequently became principal of the Froebel Educational Institute. Woodham Smith. (1952) op. cit. p. 54.

13). Kamm. op. cit. pp. 87-88. Murray. op. cit. pp. 81-82. Rich. op. cit. pp. 261-262. For a history of the college see: Lilley, I. M. (1981) Maria Grey College 1878-1976. London, West London Institute of Higher Education.

14). After it had moved to Harborne Road. Last. op. cit. pp. 6-7.

15). Woodham Smith. op. cit. p. 42. William Herford, who lectured there, dedicated The Student's Froebel to Anna Snell. Herford, W. H. (1905) The Student's Froebel. London, Sir Isaac Pitman.

16). Betts, G. (1953) 'Miss Fanny Franks and the Camden House School' National Froebel Foundation Bulletin. No. 83. August. pp. 2-4. Betts herself trained at the school. See her obituary: National Froebel Foundation Bulletin. No.97. Dec. 1955. pp. 17-18. Woodham Smith. (1952) op. cit. p. 49.

17). Betts. op. cit. p. 2.

18). Woodham Smith. (1952) op. cit. p. 50. Curwen wrote a number of articles on music for Child Life the Froebelian journal. They included: Curwen, A. J. (1899a) 'Music in the Concrete'. Child Life Vol. 1. No. 2. pp. 67-72 and Curwen, A. J. (1899b) 'Connectedness and Continuity in Musical Education'. Child Life Vol. 1. No. 3. pp. 121-124. See also: Curwen, A. J.

(1896) 'Kindergarten Music from the Ethical and Intellectual Point of View'. Journal of Education. Vol. XVIII. Nov. pp. 650-652.

19). Woodham Smith. (1952) op. cit. p. 50. Cooke took over Ruskin's class at F. D. Maurice's Working Men's College. Joseph Payne lectured there on Pestalozzi and, along with Charles Lake, he prompted Cooke to turn to Pestalozzi's writing. See: Pestalozzi, J. H. (1894) How Gertrude Teaches Her Children. London, George Allen and Unwin. (edited and itroduced by Ebenezer Cooke) p. xi. Cooke helped found a Pestalozzi Society in 1897. This was a study group which involved Sadler and the Froebelians Fanny Franks, Mrs Curwen and Agnes Ward. Journal of Education. Vol. XX. April. p. 254. Even Morant was present at the founding meeting. Child Life Vol. 1. No. 1. p. 56. Cooke gave art lessons to the children of Penelope Lawrence (who was principal of the Froebel Society's Training College after the departure of Caroline Bishop. Murray. op. cit. p72.) at their house at Wimbeldon Park in the early 1880's from which emerged Roedean School. Lawrence, S. (1914) 'Ebenezer Cooke: An Appreciation'. Child Life Vol. XVI. No. 87. pp. 72-74. On Cooke's contribution to art teaching in schools see: Bramwell, R. D. (1961) Elementary School Work 1900-25. Durham, University of Durham Institute of Education. p. 83. Cooke's principal argument was that children drew in different ways to adults and, as a consequence, art teaching should follow their natural development. Cooke, E. (1886) 'Our Art Teaching and Child Nature'. Journal of Education. Vol. VIII. Jan. pp. 12-15.

20). Bedfordshire Times Nov 5. 1881. reproduced in Smart, R. (1982) Bedford Training College 1882-1982. Bedford, Bedford Training College Publication Committee. p. 18.

21). PRO ED 21 109/16. 'Bedford Kindergarten Schools and Training College Inspectors' Report 17th-18th July 1902'.

22). Smart. op. cit. p. 44.

23). ibid. pp. 49-50. PRO ED 21 109/16. op. cit.

24). ibid.

25). PP. 1895. XLVIII. Royal Commission on Secondary Education. Reports of the Assistant Commisioners. pp. 30-31. The kindergarten competed with 'a large number of small private schools' but was said to be at a disadvantage as it did not prepare pupils for the 'methods of instruction at present pursued at higher schools'.

26). PRO ED 21 109/16. op. cit.

27). Murray. op. cit. p. 75.

28). ibid. p. 74. Woodham Smith. op. cit. p. 48.

29). Ford, C. and Harrison, B. (1983) A Hundred Years Ago. Harmondsworth, Penguin. p. 51.

30). See: Campbell, F. (1956) Eleven-Plus and All That. London, C. A. Watts. pp. 15-19.

31). Kamm. op. cit. p. 55.

32). ibid. p. 32.

33). Clarke, A. K. (1953) A History of Cheltenham Ladies College 1853-1953. London, Faber and Faber. pp. 64-66. This was in line with Dorothea Beale's intention to, 'prepare women for their natural vocation in the world, as mothers of families, as social workers. as the companions of men and as teachers'. Board of Education (19230 Report of the Consultative Committee on Differentiation of the Curriculum for Boys and Girls Respectively in Secondary Schools. London, HMSO. p. 30.

34). Thus there were kindergartens like the one attached to the British and Foreign Training College at Stockwell which had been opened by Eleonore Heerwart as, principally, a practising school and there were others - as this one became under the Misses Crombie in 1883 - which were simply private schools. See: Journal of Education. Vol. III. Nov. (Advertisement).

35). Murray. op. cit. p. 71. Murray's book may be regarded as official as Sadler encouraged her to write it specially for Syllabus 3 of the Board of Education' s Scheme of Study for Training Colleges. See also note 22. Introduction.

36). Thompson (1977) op. cit. p. 206.

37). Armytage (1969a) op. cit. p. 57. See: Felkin, H. M. and Felkin, E. (1895) An Introduction to Herbart's Science and Practice of Education. London, Swan Sonnenschein. It was perhaps emblematic that Mundella, who epitomized the political outlook of the middle class manufacturer should have his political career terminated by the financial scandal following the collapse of the New Zealand Loan Company. Halévy, E. (1939b) A History of the English People. Epilogue. Book 1. p. 38.

38). The Revised Code continued in force until 31st March 1871 when it was replaced by the New Code of that year. This was intended to last until 31st March 1883 at which time it was replaced by the New Code of 1882. This was in force until 31st August 1890. All three of these Codes were subject to annual revision. Sadler and Edwards. op. cit. pp. 34 and 38.

39). Sutherland (1973) op. cit. p. 230. Evidence of Patrick Cumin. PP. 1886. XXV. op. cit. Qs. 836-846. Evidence of Joshua Fitch. PP. XXX. op. cit. Q. 56,937.

40). Christian. op. cit. p. 119.

41). ibid. pp. 44-45. Raymont. op. cit. p. 252. On Mundella's technique for handling delegations see: Kekewich. op. cit. p. 289.

42). Woodham Smith. (1952) op. cit. pp. 55-56.

43). Child Life. Vol. X. No. 38. 1908. p. 67. 'In Memoriam Alfred Bourne'.

44). Journal of Education. Vol. XIV. April. 1892. p. 168.

45). Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1880-81. p. 294.

46). ibid. p. 294-5.

47). ibid.

48). The gallery was much used in Wesleyan schools and the Wesleyans thought that it was: 'an indispensable agent in their system of conveying religious and moral instruction'. Marvin. (ed) op. cit. p. 41. The use of the gallery was also advocated by Wilderspin. Board of Education (1933) op. cit. p. 6. and McCann and Young. op. cit. p. 159. Raymont. op. cit. p. 242.

49). Grant, C. (1929) Farthing Bundles. London, Self-Published. pp. 58-9. and Brown Smith, H. (1921) 'The Kindergarten' in Watson, F. (ed) op. cit. p. 934.

50). Grant. op. cit. p. 55.

51). Evidence of Miss E. M. Castle. PP. 1887. XXIX. op. cit. Q. 19,819. Miss Castle taught in a rural school near Petworth. In London the school board erected schools on the 'Prussian' model with a room for each class. Philpott. op. cit. p. 33. The 'Rules to be Observed in the Planning and Fitting of Schools' which were issued by the Committee of Council on Education did not allow the teaching in the same room of infants and older pupils. Board of Education (1933) op. cit. pp. 23-24.

52). Circular No. 212. Report of the Committee of Council 1883-84. pp. 149-50.

53). See: Sutherland (1973) op. cit. pp. 252-253.

54). Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1881-82. p. 123. On average, the merit grant constituted 28% of the total grant in 1885. Other grants for infant schools were available. These included a fixed grant for average attendance and grants for singing and needlework. Based upon: Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1885-86. p. xviii.

55). Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1881-82. p. 123.

56). Education Circular of Instructions to their Majesty's Inspectors as to the Uniformity of the New Code. Circular 228. p. 4.

57). Fitch, J. G. (1895) 'Teachers and the State'. Journal of Education. Vol. XVII. May. pp. 278-279.

58). The Health Exhibition Literature. op. cit. p. 145.

59). Rooper, a pupil of T. H. Green, became an HMI by means of the Duke of Bedford's patronage. Sutherland (1973) op. cit. pp. 59-60. Gordon and White op. cit. pp. 179-180.

60). Henry Holman was head of the Training Department at Aberystwyth 1892-94. He subsequently became an HMI.

61). Sadler, M. E. (1911b) 'Sir Joshuah Girling Fitch' in Monroe, P. (ed) A Cylopedia of Education. Vol. 2. New York, Macmillan. pp. 617-618. Raymont op. cit. p. 247. called him, 'One of the most influential of the inspectors during the period...' Fitch had begun his career as a teacher and he became principal of the Borough Road Training College before becoming, with Mathew Arnold's assistance, an HMI. A new type of state expert, in that he was not only not a notable but he was also a practioner, Fitch served as an Assistant Commissioner on the Schools

Inquiry Commission (1864-67), as a Special Commissioner for the Reports on Schools for the Poorer Classes (1870) and as an Assistant Commissioner under the Endowed Schools Act (1870-1877).

62). Robertson op. cit. p. 320. Note 1.

63). Fitch. (1897) op. cit. p. 192.

64). ibid. p. 195.

65). ibid. p. 197.

66). ibid. pp. 196-197.

67). ibid. p. 197.

68). ibid. p. 198.

69). ibid. p. 199.

70). ibid.

71). See: chapter 4, pp. 192-193. For Emily Shirreff it was 'most important' to urge the claims of the kindergarten 'upon all educational departments that include infant schools, to induce them to adopt that method'. Shirreff, E. A. (1887) 'Infant Schools and Kindergartens'. Journal of Education. Vol. IX. April. pp. 187-188.

72). Journal of Education. Vol. V. July. 1883. p. 226.

73). ibid.

74). See Froebel (1900a) op. cit. His explanations accompanying the relevant illustrations are on pp. 176, 186 and 188 respectively.

75). Journal of Education. Vol. V. July. 1883. p. 226.

76). Bowen, H. C. (1887) 'Hints to Froebel Students'. Journal of Education. Vol. IX. May. p. 231. Bowen was a member of Lake's Education Society and between 1882 and 1886 he was principal of the ill-fated Finsbury

Training College which was established to train male secondary teachers. See: Rich op. cit. p. 263.

77). Bourne, A. (1884) 'Infants' Schools Under the Code of 1884' in The Health Exhibition Literature. op. cit. pp. 121-122 and p. 126.

78). ibid. pp. 125-126.

79). The Health Exhibition Literature. op. cit. p. 143.

80). ibid. p. 148. Alfred Sonnenschein was a supporter of the Hungarian democrat, Louis Kossuth (1820-1894). He settled in England and became a teacher and a writer of school books. DNB for his son Edward Adolf Sonnenschein (1851-1929). For Kossuth see: Hobsbawm, E. J. (1973) The Age of Revolution. London, Cardinal. pp. 156 and 171.

81). The Health Exhibition Literature. op. cit. p. 149.

82). ibid. pp. 150-151.

83). ibid. pp. 145-146.

84). ibid.

85). Manning, E. A. (1884) 'What Froebel Did for Young Children' in The Health Exhibition Literature. op. cit. p. 85.

86). ibid. p. 84.

87). ibid.

88). ibid. p. 85.

89). ibid. p. 86.

90). Bourne. op. cit. p. 127.

91). See: Cole, G. D. H. and Postgate, R. (1966) The Common People 1746-1946. London, Methuen. p. 277. Hammond, J. L. and Hammond, B. (1947) The Bleak Age. West Drayton, Penguin. p. 220.

92). The Health Exhibition Literature. op. cit. p. 89.

93). ibid. p. 91. A Unitarian, Rosamond Davenport Hill was the daughter of Mathew Davenport Hill, the founder, in 1819, of the Hazelwood school at Birmingham. See: Stewart. op cit. pp. 54-64. She was also the neice of the Frederic Davenport Hill referred to in chapter 1, p. 40. Rosamond Davenport Hill was a Progressive (the Liberal/Nonconformist party) member of the London School Board from 1879 to 1897. Gautrey. op. cit. pp. 55-56. And she chaired the London School Board's Cookery Committee from 1882. DNB. In 1889 she was elected to the Council of the Froebel Society. Journal of Educsation. Vol. XI. Feb. 1889. p. 92.

94). See also Shirreff (1887) op. cit. p. 188. 'The only serious difficulty is that of providing duly trained teachers'.

95). Journal of Education. Vol. XI. Feb. 1889. p. 92. He claimed at the annual meeting of the Froebel society that 'not a single expert in the kindergarten principles and system' had been examined by the Cross Commission. Edward Lyulph Stanley (1839-1925) was a member of the London School Board, with only a short interruption, from 1876 until its abolition in 1904. For four years a Liberal MP, Stanley was instrumental in the foundation, in 1889, of the National Education Association, a Liberal/Nonconformist vehicle formed to fight for education which was to be 'efficient, progressive, unsectarian and under popular control'. Vice-chair of the London School Board from 1897, he was the leader of the Progressives on the Board. DNB. Gautrey op. cit. p. 51. said of him that his 'knowledge of all the Board's works was phenomenal' and Wallas said that he represented 'a splendid but almost impossible ideal of administrative efficiency'. Wallas, M. op. cit. p. 82. His performance on the Cross Commission bears out these assessments.

96). PP. 1886. XXV. op. cit. Q. 10,570.

97). Woodham Smith (1952) op. cit. p. 58. claims that Bourne and Mrs Buxton presented 'a series of resolutions' to the Cross commission but none appeared as memorials.

98). Evidence of Lydia Manley. PP. 1886. XXV. op. cit. Qs. 13,184 - 13,190. Lydia Manley (1847-1911) was appointed head teacher at Stockwell in 1884 to replace Eleonore Heerwart and she became the principal of the college in 1892. In 1900 she became a member of the first Consultative Committee of the Board of Education (PRO ED 24/186) and the author of an obituary described her as an 'able adviser in State methods of education'. Times Educational Supplement. August 1. 1911. A. H. Wood, the secretary to the Consultative Committee (1907-1909) described her as a useful member of the Consultative Committee, 'not merely as an expert on Training College questions but indirectly through her practical experience of the product of Elementary and Secondary schools'. PRO ED 24/218 Wood to Morant 14/9/1911.

99). PP. 1886. XXV. op. cit. Q. 13,051.

100). PP. 1887. XXIX. op. cit. Q. 15,618.

101). ibid. Q. 15,664.

102). ibid. Qs. 15,666 - 15,667.

103). Bourne PP. 1886. XXV. op. cit. Q. 7,887. and evidence of Mark Wilks PP. 1887. XXX. op. cit. Q. 48,725.

104). The time table is included as an appendix. PP. 1886. XXV. op. cit. pp. 540-541.

105). ibid. Evidence of Rev. T. W. Sharpe. Q. 4,305.

106). PP.1887. XXIX. op. cit. Q.15,665.

107). ibid. Q.4,306.

108). ibid. Q.4,308.

109). Woodham Smith. (1952) op. cit. p. 41.

110). Evidence of Henry Williams. PP. 1887. XXX. op. cit. Q. 48,486.

111). ibid. Q.48,553.

112). ibid. Q.48,540. Another 'representative of the Working Classes', Thomas Powell also referred to the division in the working class imposed by the different levels of school fees. See: evidence of Thomas Eckford Powell PP. 1887. XXX. op. cit. Q. 52,899.

113). PP. 1886. XXV. op. cit. Q. 9,932.

114). Wilks was first elected to the London School Board in 1875 and he was a member until 1888. From 1880 to 1885 he was chair of the school management committee. Graham Wallas, who also chaired this important committee, said of Wilks that, along with Rev. John Rodgers and Stanley, he was a member of 'a triumvirate who knew everything and were not far from doing everything in the name of the Board'. Wallas, M. op. cit. p.82. For the use of 'progressive' in this sense see: Clarke, P. F. (1974) 'The Progressive Movement in England'. Transactions of the Royal Historical Society. Fifth Series. Vol. 24. pp. 159-181.

115). PP. 1887. XXX. op. cit. Qs.49,122 - 49,124.

116). ibid. Q. 48,724.

117). ibid. Q. 48,725.

118). ibid. Q. 48,716.

119). ibid. Q. 48,718.

120). ibid. Q. 48,716.

121). ibid. Q. 48,677.

122). ibid. Qs. 48,781- 48,783.

123). PP. 1888. XXXV. op. cit. p. 151.

124). ibid. p. 217.

125). ibid. p. 252.

126). ibid. p. 305.

127). ibid.

Chapter 6

THE KINDERGARTEN AND BIDS TO MODERNIZE THE SCHOOLING OF THE WORKING CLASS.

1.0 Introduction.

During the 1890's, several determined attempts were made to modernize the elementary school curriculum. Initiatives were also launched which eventually altered some of the conditions described in Chapter 4. Regarding the curriculum of the elementary schools, the drive towards modernization was led initially by the large, urban school boards but, following the publication of the Report of the Cross Commission, the Education Department itself, became involved in attempts to modernize the curriculum of the elementary schools. At the same time the conditions under which elementary schooling took place were altered by a series of measures which culminated, in 1895, in the abandonment, by the Education Department, of the annual inspection of schools. This move virtually abolished the system of payment by results.(1) The continued existence of large classes, poor accomodation and rote methods of learning prevent these measures from being described as revolutionary but the ending of payment by results transformed, in a fundamental way, the relation between teachers and the central authority. Describing the new regime introduced by the abolition of payment by results, the Board of Education's Report for 1910, contained the opinion that:

> Within reasonable limits managers and teachers were now free to choose what they should teach and how they

> should teach it, without regard to the probable effect of their choice upon examination results and the financial stability of their schools.(2)

Some of the consequences that this had for teacher professionalization are taken up in the next chapter; here the focus is upon the potential for the expansion and the reform of the curriculum that the abolition of payment by results created. This potential was also enhanced by changes in the Code. Of these, those that were introduced in the Code of 1890 were of the greatest importance. In this Code the grants for the Three R's were abolished and the NUT's demand that teachers should classify children by ability and not age was conceded. In theory, this meant that the drill methods, which were used to bring all children up to a certain Standard, could now be dispensed with.

In accounts of these changes it is customary to focus on the role of certain individuals, like George Kekewich, in bringing them about.(3) However these accounts tend to obscure the role of groups, linked to broad social forces, which were operating on the terrain of the politics of school knowledge. Thus, in this chapter, these shifts, together with the changes in the definition of what counted as appropriate knowledge for working class pupils, are considered as the outcomes of campaigns led by the NUT and by the modernizers. In this perspective, Kekewich, who in 1890 succeeded Cumin as Permanent Secretary at the Education Department, is seen less as an exceptional individual and more as someone open to the arguments of the modernizers who also happened to occupy a key position within the educational apparatus of the state.

The relationship of the modernizers to the Froebel movement, during the 1890's, forms the core of the first part of this chapter. The nature of the relationship between the Froebel movement and the modernizers had a dual aspect. A faction within the Froebel movement, organized around the wood carving system known as Sloyd, for a period in the late 1880's and early 1890's, reorientated the claims concerning the benefits of the kindergarten so that they corresponded to the demands that schooling approximate more closely to the requirements of industry being advanced by the modernizers. In what might be considered as an act of reciprocity, the modernizers adopted the language of the Froebelians as the ideological cover for their demands and to grant to them, an educational justification. Owing to the central place accorded here to the Sloyd movement in the relationship between the Froebel movement and the modernizers, Sloyd and its effects will receive particular attention.

Following this, an attempt will be made to assess the extent to which the strategies of modernization were successful. This will involve an account of innovations in the school board of London and a brief survey of the effects of the Education Department's attempts to introduce a more practical curriculum into the elementary schools.

The second part of this chapter will contain a close look at the relation between the state educational apparatus and the Froebel movement as revealed by a number of Circulars which emanated from the Education Department during the 1890's. This will be followed by a review of evidence selected from the reports of HMI which throws some light on the extent to which the intentions of the Department contained within the Circulars were translated into changes in school practices.

Regarded solely from the point of view of the Froebel movement, the decade of the 1890's was was one of opportunity. Official encouragement was forthcoming and increasingly, Froebelian arguments were used to justify practices alternative to those which may be thought of as being traditional. These alternatives, which were aimed at making the elementary school curriculum more 'practical', were supported by many Froebelians but they also brought about the accentuation of certain Froebelian ideas and practices and the down grading of others. In particular, this period within the Froebel movement was marked by the ascendancy of what might be called the 'hand and eye' faction and it was this faction which linked the Froebel movement to the programmes of the modernizers associated with the industrial fraction of the power bloc.

2.0 Hand and Eye: The Froebel Movement and Modernization.

While commenting on an article on Manual Instruction which had appeared in the Spectator, the Journal of Education, in 1888, pointed out that Manual Instruction was advocated by three groups: those who wished to 'increase the skill of our workmen'; those who think that "book-learning" makes the labouring class dissatisfied with their lot' and those 'who would have *all* children trained by means of *things* ...'.(4)

Outside the rural areas, the second of these groups had declined considerably in importance since the days of the 'Blagdon Controversy' when Hannah More's, Sunday Schools were attacked for spreading subversion.(5) Because of its increasing marginality, this group was far less important than the first one whose argument for training for industry was characteristic of a modernizing stance. The third group, whose argument was educational, had little support outside what existed of a

'pedagogical community' but within it, this group was represented by the Froebel movement, the main carrier of Rousseau and Pestalozzi's injunction to teach by things rather than words.(6)

One of the main problems with the analysis of the Journal of Education concerns the extent to which the educational argument for Manual Instruction, which was that of the Froebel movement, ought to be regarded as discrete and the extent to which it is best regarded as mere appearance; a cover for an underlying, 'real' interest. It would be grossly reductionist to argue that the wish to teach children by things rather than words was simply a reflex of the requirements of capitalist production. But the ways in which that position was utilised by both modernizers and Froebelians suggest that any explanation of the hand and eye argument needs to take into account the context in which it arose. That context was marked by fears of a loss of industrial competetiveness and the promotion of a number of educational solutions designed to remedy that loss.

2.1 Hand and Eye: The Froebelian Approach.

At the International Health Exhibition which was discussed in the previous chapter, a paper was read by Eleonore Heerwart entitled, 'The Kindergarten in Relation to the Various Industrial Products of a Country'.(7) Heerwart was an orthodox Froebelian whose attitude to Froebel's gifts and occupations was most dogmatic; in her view, they were both simple and 'correct'.(8) They were also, in her view, the best possible basis for Technical Education. Consequently, Heerwart concluded that, 'the Kindergarten, viewed in this light, commends itself to the notice of employers in every country'.(9) The distance between the kindergarten

occupations and the 'nation's industries' was spanned, according to Heerwart, by the training of hand and eye which accompanied the use of the kindergarten apparatus such as:

> paper-twisting, stick-plaiting, stick-laying, the jointed lath, pea-work, ring and thread-laying, drawing and sewing on card ...(10)

As was seen in chapter 1, the Froebelian emphasis on the importance of work predated the emergence, in the 1880's, of the 'schools and industry' and the 'decline of Britain' debates. In Heerwart's view, the child at an early stage 'must be prepared for work' for the reason that, as Froebel said, God works and therefore so should we.(11) Advancing secularisation in the late Nineteenth Century would have robbed that argument of the force that it might once have possessed but the Froebelians had another, perhaps more persuasive, educational argument for hand and eye training.

2.2 Race Recapitulation.

In the year before Heerwart had presented her paper, the first English translation of the Baroness Von Marenholtz-Bülow's book, Hand Work and Head Work had appeared. In it, the Baroness presented her conception of the relation between the hand and the brain. She drew extensively on the doctrine of race recapitulation which, as Gould has put it, was, 'among the most influential ideas of late nineteenth century science'.(12) This doctrine held that in its passage from the embryo to adulthood, the human species or the 'race', recapitulates former stages of evolution not only physically but, in some versions, culturally as well. Herbert Spencer claimed that the French sociologist, Comte originated this notion but Froebel had earlier expressed a similar notion in his Education of

Man.(13) Whatever its origin, the fact that it could be detected in Froebel's work ensured that race recapitulation theory was utilised by Froebelians like the Baroness.

Frequently, race recapitulation was used to link notions of childhood, one of an evolving series of hierarchically ordered stages, with the inherently, hierarchical, notion of race. Thus, in the kindergarten, wrote Heerwart, a historian regarding the children's use of occupations would:

> watch the stages of development as history has witnessed those of barbarous tribes, who have afterwards excelled in arts and industries.(14)

In the somewhat, materialist analysis of the race recapitulationists the use of the hand was a stage of development which preceded that of the brain and similarly, doing preceded thinking.(15) Therefore, through work, ran the argument, the brain could be trained by the use of the hand.

That hand and eye training was sanctioned by Froebelian arguments of an educational nature is beyond dispute but similar educational arguments were also frequently attached to the argument for training which was made by the modernizers. As was shown in chapter 3, the Froebelians had close social and political links with the modernizers and so the emergence of a strategy among some Froebelians which aimed to attach the kindergarten to the modernizers project was not unsurprising. Such a strategy was made explicit by Emily Shirreff, for example, during her address to the annual meeting of the Froebel Society in 1889. Before this gathering, which was chaired by A.J.Mundella, by then a NAPTSE leader,(16) Shirreff declared:

> Let the promoters of technical training [...] help us to make Froebel known through the length and breadth of the land and they will have done more than they have yet done to promote their own cause.(17)

The anxiety of many Froebelians, which was caused by their inability to break out of the middle and upper class ghetto of private schooling, was understandable but the price which had to be paid for an alliance with the modernizers was that the emphasis on the Froebelian couplet of play and work shifted decisively towards the pole of work. So prevalent, by 1892, were arguments within the Froebel movement for seeing the kindergarten as primarily a system of hand and eye training that a journal to promote this line, called appropriately Hand and Eye, was brought out in that year. This soon eclipsed Child Life, the original journal of the movement.(18) Moreover, the principal function of the new journal was not the promotion of the kindergarten but to popularize among teachers the use of Sloyd.(19)

3.0 The Moment of Sloyd.

In the late 1880's there occurred a remarkable surge of interest, among teachers and others connected with schooling, in a system of handwork known as Slöjd or as it was more commonly spelt, Sloyd. This fashionable system originated in Sweden where it had been developed by Otto Salomon (1849-1907) His practice was based on that of Uno Cygnaeus (1810-1888), the organizer and director of the 'folk-schools' of Finland. Cygnaeus, in turn, claimed that his ideas and practices which made handwork the basis of education, were derived from Froebel and Pestalozzi.(20) The derivation of the system, however, is perhaps of less important in explaining the

popularity of Sloyd among Froebelians than their receptivity to ways of teaching by 'things' rather than words.

One of the first accounts of the Sloyd system appeared in 1887, in an article written by Evelyn Chapman and published in the Journal of Education.(21) Chapman's article contained a description of a course held at Nääs, where in 1872, Salomon's uncle, a wealthy Gothenburg merchant called Abrahamson, had founded a Sloyd 'seminary'. At Nääs, the system was revealed to consist of the production of a graded series of wooden models, including the emblematic spoon, by a number of processes which included carving with the equally emblematic, Sloyd knife.(22) These activities were designed to form the centre of the education of children aged eleven years and older who were too old for the kindergarten occupations.

In stressing the educational arguments for handwork, Chapman made strenuous efforts to differentiate Sloyd from carpentry. The objects produced in Sloyd, she claimed, were generally smaller than those of carpentry, the tools were different and no division of labour was permitted in Sloyd. But, in her view, the chief difference lay:

> in the *object* of Slöjd, which is not to turn out full-blown, or half-blown, or even quarter-blown young carpenters, but to develope the faculties, and specially to give *general* dexterity, which will be useful whatever line of life the pupil may afterwards follow.(23)

Like Heerwart, whose argument was cited above, Chapman, in her article, insisted that the aim of handwork was general and not specific. In

addition, and also like Heerwart, her educational case was butressed by an extrinsic aim, namely preparation for work.

3.1 The Psychology of Sloyd.

Her reference to 'faculties' indicates that Chapman was enmeshed within the discourse of faculty psychology, the dominant contemporary theory of learning which has been encountered in the work of Fitch. In faculty psychology, the mind consisted of innate, separate faculties, such as knowing, feeling and willing, which required training and constant exercise to develop and strengthen them.(24) For this to occur effectively some subjects were thought to be more suited than others. Typically, the classics were held to be the most efficacious for training the faculties as they were believed to be, what Arnold called, 'formative'.(25) For a subject to be formative it did not require utility in the pupil's future life; its content was of little consequence. What mattered most to its proponents was the belief that the discipline acquired from the study of a subject could be transferred to other fields. Thus the classics could be defended not on the grounds that knowledge of Imperial Rome may have had some uses to those who were to run an Empire but on the grounds that they trained the will and the memory.

This doctrine was particularly prominent when the classics, having lost their former utility and vocational aspect, came under attack in the Nineteenth Century from promoters of natural science.(26) The defence of the prominent place occupied by the classics in the education of 'gentlemen' was a purely ideological one in the negative, distorting sense, for the classics owed their prominence not to their supposed disciplinary effects but to their social function which was referred to in chapter 2.

Nevertheless, the faculty psychology and the associated notions of formal discipline and transfer of training were the 'common sense' of most Nineteenth Century curriculum debate. Thus, when the advocates of new subjects, such as handwork, justified their inclusion in the school curriculum they did so, initially, with reference to the faculties which were held to be trained by them.

Chapman was no exception; the mental faculty trained by Sloyd was, according to her, that of 'the *practical* side of the intelligence' and this took place by the exercise of 'energy, perserverance, order, accuracy, and the habit of attention'.(27) The moral effects of Sloyd were enumerated as well. These had a particular inflection towards labour and they included the implantation of 'respect and love for work in general' and 'a sense of satisfaction in honest work'.(28)

3.2 The Specificity of Sloyd Propaganda.

With inflated claims like these, Sloyd was introduced to an English audience as an educational elixir and Chapman's language and that of other converts, was frequently that of the seller of patent medecine. The 'hand-education' provided by Sloyd, was, for example, described by her as 'the true remedy for over-pressure of the brain'.(29) There is little that is exceptional in this. Advocates of pedagogic fashions usually made extravagant claims for their particular enthusiasm; what makes Chapman's presentation of Sloyd slightly unusual, however, is that while she did not abandon entirely the formation of character as the main aim of education she tended to give it a less exalted place than was usual and, correspondingly, she gave a greater emphasis than was usual to education as a preparation for work. Secondly, she saw Sloyd as an extension of the kindergarten, 'the very soul of which', she wrote, was 'its response to the child's need of activity and production'.(30) The parallels here with much Marxist thought on education are striking (31) but a fundamental difference between those formulations and that of Chapman is that she linked the self-production of men and women through work not to a new form of society but to an international struggle for survival. Among the major powers, she claimed, 'even far distant Japan' was 'showing an interest in the subject' and, in an alarmist conclusion, she noted that Sloyd would 'probably be taken up in Abbyssinia'.(32) If Sloyd were not adopted in English schools, Chapman argued, there was a danger of being 'left hopelessly behind' for 'our young people' could not possibly hold their own 'against the youth of other countries, coming fresh from schools where eye and hand have been trained to *general dexterity* ...'(33)

In terms of the distinctions between supporters of Manual instruction made by the Journal of Education, Chapman's position spanned that of both the educational and training arguments. As was the case frequently, attempts to maintain that distinction were untenable. However, in practice it mattered little whether Sloyd was introduced in order to produce beneficial moral effects or to halt the nation's industrial decline for handwork, in the schools, could have been adopted simply to vary the curriculum or as part of a strategy, 'to amuse the lads and call forth their intellectual curiosity'.(34) Nevertheless, justifications for educational practice which take this form are few and they lack the requisite seriousness of purpose which is inherent in appeals to national survival.

3.3 The Organizational Forms of the Sloyd Movement.

As amusement is rarely considered to be a sufficient ground for the justification of school knowledge, it was not often proposed. Instead, in its organizational forms, the Sloyd movement combined those who argued for handwork on educational grounds with those whose aims had more to do with straightforward, training for industrial occupations. Among both groups interest in Sloyd grew rapidly during the late 1880's. In July, 1887, Miss J. W. Warren, one of the first teachers from England to go to Nääs, addressed a meeting of the Teachers' Guild on the topic of the 'Nääs Slöjd System'.(35) In the following year, thirty four teachers from England attended the Summer School at Nääs(36) and Miss Chapman and Miss Nyström ran a Summer School on the Sloyd system at Birmingham.(37) The girls' high schools also were attracted by the vogue for Sloyd, as Chapman had

urged. Among these was Sydenham College for Ladies, a newly opened GPDST school, where Sloyd was taught to the older pupils. (38)

In 1888, the Sloyd Association of Great Britain and Ireland was formed. Its President was the ubiquitous, 'philanthropist', Reginald Brabazon, the Earl of Meath (1841-1929). (39) Miss Chapman and Miss Nyström were the Association's joint Honorary Secretaries and among its Vice-Presidents were Arthur Acland, at that time a joint General Secretary of the NAPTSE.(40) Other Vice-Presidents included Miss Buss and the President of the Froebel Society, Emily Shirreff.(41) The other joint General Secretary of the NAPTSE, Sir Henry Roscoe, became President of the Sloyd Association for Manchester and District.(42) Among those who, at this time, made the journey to Nääs were Rosamond Davenport Hill, who had written on Technical Education,(43) the Positivist, HMI and Froebel sympathiser, F. S. Marvin,(44) and HMI Thomas Godolphin Rooper, who, as was noted in the previous chapter, was among the earliest advocates of the adoption by schools of the Froebelian pedagogy.

Students from England who had attended the course at Nääs, formed a separate Sloyd organization, in 1888, which they called the Sloyd Union.(45) In the following year, the Sloyd Association, proposed a merger with the Froebel Society.(46) This offer was declined but two years later, the Sloyd Association and the Sloyd Union merged and took the title of the former body. This new Sloyd Association of Great Britain and Ireland had for its president, Lyulph Stanley, the leader of the Liberal/Nonconformist bloc on the London School Board. (47)

By 1904, interest in Sloyd had begun to wane and the Association merged with the Educational Handwork Union, yet another Sloyd organization, to

become the Educational Handwork Association. Some of the determinants of this transition from Sloyd to educational handwork will be considered in chapter 8, where the work of Dewey will be discussed. At about the same Manual Training became seen less and less as a weapon in the international struggle for survival. The politics of this shift will be discussed in chapter 10 but the result was that specialised approaches like Sloyd were left stranded. On another level, it may be argued that enthusiasm for systems of handwork like Sloyd simply transferred to a greater variety of handwork materials and objects.(48) In this guise it survived as a feature of the education provided in the progressive schools of the inter-war period. (49)

3.4 HMI Support For Sloyd.

Part of Sloyd's significance for the Froebel movement was the way in which its popularity gave further strength to a view of the kindergarten which regarded it principally as an instrument for hand and eye training. To a large degree, as will be seen, this was the official view of the Education Department about which Herford had complained. From within the ranks of the Department's staff came two powerful arguments in support of this interpretation. One of these was put forward by T. G. Rooper whose support for Froebel's ideas may have had a little to do with his attachment to idealist philosophy which was a result of his contact with T. H. Green and his friendship with Bernard Bosanquet.(50) However, what seems to have drawn Rooper to the particular aspect Froebel's work which was enshrined in Sloyd was not the latter's idealist tendencies but his, 'doctrine of the need of manual work in any and every course of studies'.(51) Like many others who wished to see the elementary school

curriculum made more 'practical', Rooper's argument was a self-consciously educational one. By the introduction of handwork, he wrote, 'we seek to improve education not industry'. (52) Similarly, he argued that Sloyd was not predominantly a means of developing an aptitude for a particular craft but a way of filling a gap which, 'experience shows to exist where education is purely literary'.(53)

Like Chapman, Rooper also enumerated the moral lessons which handwork was held to provide. As with the faculty argument, this is another instance of staying within the bounds set by the dominant traditional view of the aim of schooling. Some of the virtues which Rooper claimed were encouraged by Sloyd might just as easily have been claimed for Arithmetic; others he listed were specific to Sloyd:

> diligence, perserverance, love of order, neatness, dexterity, caution, a love of construction, a respect for the work of men's hands, and a contempt for wanton destruction.(54)

In this list there is more than a hint of the 'romance of labour' position commonly associated with William Morris (55) and in another form, with John Ruskin. (56) However, in Rooper's practice of beginning woodwork classes in Bradford schools, he was concerned with the response of the mill owners.(57) Elsewhere, referring to his work in Bradford, he wrote of the positive moral effects of woodwork on boys whom he described as 'street arabs'.(58) In other words, although Rooper's discourse on manual work bore similarities to that of Morris, it was articulated to a practice not of the emancipation of the working class but of its moralisation and industrial training.

Another HMI who was an ardent propagandist for handwork was Henry Holman the former Professor of Education at Aberystwyth. Holman's arguments were drawn from a wide variety of sources which included the work of the neurophysiologists, race recapitulation, Ruskin and educationalists like Pestalozzi and Froebel. In his book entitled, Hand and Eye Training, Holman declared that Froebel was the first to 'organize manual training into an educational system' and that 'everybody knows that Froebel's *gifts* and *occupations* are essentially hand and eye training instruments'.(59) In Holman's version of Froebel, the play of young children was merely a prologue to work. From within the Froebel movement support for Holman's view was provided by, among others, Courthope Bowen. His book on Froebel, which looked critically at the Froebelian orthodoxy, was widely used and in it he wrote that, 'manual training is a direct outcome of the kindergarten exercises' and that work was 'the very foundation of Froebel's system'.(60)

3.5 An Official View of Sloyd.

Despite the enthusiasm for Sloyd, the Education Department, even during the period when the 'bitter little Rad',(61) Arthur Acland was Vice President, did not produce an evaluation of the system. In this instance, Acland's interest in Sloyd, an interest which he shared with his wife Alice (1849-1935), a founder of the Women's Co-operative League,(62) failed to be translated into action by the Department. There was produced, however, at this time, a Parliamentary Paper entitled Sloyd and Kindergarten Occupations in the School, which was published in 1895, the year that Acland left office. This was written for the Scotch Education Department by one of its inspectors, John Struthers, who, as Sir John Struthers,

became that Department's Secretary in 1904.(63) While this evaluation of Sloyd and aspects of the kindergarten was written for a Scottish audience and referred to practices in some Edinburgh schools, it is, nevertheless, further evidence of the tendency in official discourse to view the kindergarten mainly as an institution for manual training and as the first stage in a continuous course of handwork.

Sloyd, in Struthers' report, was defined as, 'a form of manual training in which the educational rather than the technical aim is predominant'.(64) By technical, in this context, Struthers meant training in the use of tools. Moreover, he saw Sloyd as being 'identical in purpose and effect' as the kindergarten occupations whch he had observed in use in schools.(65) He noted also, in this connection, the debt that Salomon owed to Froebel in the formulation of his system.

In a consideration of the advantages of introducing Manual Training into elementary schools, Struthers used the 'educational' arguments of the need for 'balance' and the harmonious development of the faculties which were characteristic of the Froebelians. Balance, he argued, was necessary in order to counter the 'predominantly mental or bookish character of much of our common school education'.(66) This type of education produced, he claimed, the situation described in a report of the London School Board where it was stated that many boys left school to enter casual employment from whence:

> they drift into that mass of unorganised and unskilled labour amongst which, whether employed or unemployed, such misery exists, and which constitutes a dangerous waste of national force.(67)

These sentiments which Struthers quoted approvingly have a decidedly collectivist thrust about them for the waste described was not that of individual citizens in the private sphere of civil society but of citizens who were an instrument of the nation or the public sphere of the state.

In an argument, which by the frequency of its repetition, has become naturalized in debates over the purposes of schooling, Struthers held that schools were failing the nation. The solution, he felt, was that as a first step, school life should be compulsorily lengthened. This he failed to elaborate upon and instead proposed what he described as 'a strictly educational' solution. This consisted of the 'broadening and simplification' of school curricula so as to 'remove the predisposition which at present exists towards certain kinds of employment'(68) If it achieves no other purpose, this account of Struther's report serves to illustrate, in its parallels with more recent formulations regarding cultural obstacles to industrial success, the recurrent nature of many of the elements of debate over and in education.(69) Like the more recent educational solutions advanced to counter the perceived industrial malaise, that of Struthers also involved training for work. In this case what was sought was the production of more 'manual dexterity'.(70) This training, argued Struthers, had 'value for all men, but specially of course for those of the industrial classes'.(71) Included in this category and singled out for emphasis, were 'those engaged in textile manufacture'; the 'dweller in remote country districts' and, somewhat contradictorily, 'the emigrant'.(72)

Having declared his hand by arguing explicitly for the training of the industrial classes, Struthers then reinforced his argument by an appeal to the supposed 'disciplinary effects' of Manual Training. He also drew upon a

pamphlet written by Sir James Crichton-Browne whose role in the over-pressure controversy was discussed in chapter 4. From his reading of Crichton-Browne's neurophysiological theories, Struthers concluded that:

> We have then scientific authority in favour of the assumption that the development of the hand faculty must in itself have an appreciable effect on the development of the higher mental powers.(73)

Hence the mind, in this presentation of a well worn argument, could be trained by the use of the hand in advanced cardboard work and woodwork.(74)

Struthers arguments may be seen as an instance of a practice in search of a theoretical justification. His intentions were clear; he wanted the provision by schools of training in industrial skills for , at least a section, of the working class however, such an objective lacked the legitimacy given to the traditional aim of character formation by the authority of time honoured practice. In seeking a rational basis for the proposed introduction of training in dexterity, the discoveries of the neurophysiologists provided part of the requirement while, ironically given its irrational character, Froebel's work provided another part. Thus Struthers, in describing the 'special virtue inherent in manual training' borrowed extensively from the Froebelian lexicon when he declared that it:

> has a unique power of securing and sustaining the interest of the average child and [...] it substitutes for the receptive and passive attitude on the part of the child the active and productive one.(75)

Such was the extent to which the future Secretary of the Scotch Education Department had articulated the discourse of the Froebelians to the project of training working class boys in manual dexterity that he wrote of knowledge that 'it can never be merely transferred from one person to another' and that the best education was 'self-education'.(76)

4.0 Schooling For Work: The Modernizers Case.

Thus far the arguments examined, for making the curriculum more practical, were ones which emanated from within the pedagogic community or from those who were closely involved with the educational apparatus of the state. A central part of the argument here, however, is that what has been termed the 'educational' case was to a significant extent a response to the arguments for training put by the modernizers. The year 1887 was the year when the argument of the modernizers in education took an organizational form. This was the year which internationally was especially significant in the chronology of attempts to introduce manual training into elementary schools. (77) It was also the year in which the NAPTSE was founded.(78) This organization, as was argued in chapter 2, represented a serious attempt to modernize the schooling of all classes but for present purposes it is the schooling of the working class which is of most relevance. In England, the strands of the argument which crystallised in the NAPTSE may be traced back through the Samuelson and Devonshire Royal Commissions to the 'X' Club in which Huxley was involved.(79) With respect to the elementary schools, this argument appeared in the programme of the NAPTSE encapsulated in the first and second of its objectives. These were:

> (a) The promotion in our primary schools of the better training of the hand and eye by improved instruction in drawing, in the elements of science, and the elementary use of tools.
>
> (b) The introduction of such changes in the present system of primary instruction as may be necessary to enable children to take advantage of technical training.(80)

As was noted in chapter 2, any major changes along these lines were prevented by the opposition of the Church/Tory bloc to anything that would increase the financial burden on the voluntary schools. Thus the advocates of such measures were increasingly driven to the question of the organization and control of schools which dominated the debates prior to 1902.

These questions aside, a major theme orchestrated by the modernizers was that of schools failing to supply the needs of the nation. As Sir Henry Roscoe (1833-1915), a leading advocate of science education, put it in 1887, in order to maintain Britain's industrial supremacy 'the education of her people from top to bottom must be carried out on new lines'.(81) In similar vein the industrialist, William Mather, criticised the existing schooling provided for the 'working classes' in the public elementary schools on the grounds that it did not:

> satisfy the wants of the nation, or do justice to the children who are compelled to attend the public schools.(82)

The problem with schools, as the chemistry Professor, Henry Armstrong (1876-1937), saw it was that they were places where 'desk-ridden emasculates' were reared.(83) For Sir Philip Magnus, the fault lay in the teaching in the schools which, he claimed, 'had little or no reference to the newer avenues of employment'.(84) The application of science to the processes of production, had, he suggested, created a need for 'highly skilled artisans' and for 'educated workmen of all classes'.(85) Workers, in Magnus' view, particularly needed training in manipulative skills and in the scientific principles which underlay their work. 'Our youth', he added, had to be prepared 'for the different varieties and grades of work' in which all ranks of the 'industrial army' were employed.(86)

4.1 Clothing the Case for Training.

As in the United States, during the 1890's a shift occurred in the way that the training argument was presented and justified.(87) Magnus described that shift as a move away from the earlier efforts to justify training in school which focussed on the need for more carpenters and joiners to ones which stressed 'educational' grounds.(88) It is perhaps not insignificant that the attitude of organized labour towards the kind of training discussed here also underwent a change of direction during the same period. The nature of this reformulation may be illustrated by a consideration of the Memorial to the Bryce Commission presented on behalf of the Trades and Labour Councils and the resolution on education which was passed at the Trade Union Congress of 1897. At the head of the list of individuals and organizations which presented the Memorial to Bryce, was Henry Broadhurst, a Lib/Lab MP and a leading member of the NAPTSE.(89) The significance of this lies in the fact that the Memorial

contained a view of working class secondary schooling identical to that of the NAPTSE. The memorialists declared that:

> The Secondary Education of the working classes must to a large extent be technical and manual. The first necessity for them and for the industries of the country is that they should be skilful and expert workmen and workwomen.(90)

The TUC resolution, while not discussing the content of schooling, called for 'the highest educational advantages' to be placed within 'the reach of all'.(91) Thus began a period in which organized labour began to move away from the notion that the best curriculum for the working class pupil was a technical or manual training one provided in an elementary school and towards the view that the working class was entitled to the liberal curriculum provided in the secondary schools.(92)

This change in the attitude of organized labour together with pressures for democratisation which were associated with the emergence of the democratic/ interventionist state necessitated the use of more rational or neutral, preferably 'scientific', arguments to justify attempts to provide working class pupils with a vocational curriculum. It was no longer politically viable to call simply for the industrial training of the working class and, as a consequence, such calls began to be clothed in the language of educational ideologies.

4.2 The Modernizers Use Of Froebel.

What was at stake for the modernizers was not simply a struggle against tradition but an attempt to, in Gramsci's phrase, create 'a new type of man'.(93) Specifically, the new type of man, whose description litters the

texts of the modernizers, was above all an industrial worker who would work without the necessity for coercion and who would display initiative.(94) In an example provided by Holman, the boy who had been trained in woodwork was one who, when the spinning machine broke down, would not wait to be told to repair it or wait for someone else but would repair it himself.(95) Thus the methods of schooling had to be in conformity with this objective. This, it might be argued, lay at the heart of the 'New Education' as it was thought of in relation to elementary schooling. The derivation of this much exposed label is beyond the scope of this discussion as are the multiple meanings that it bore but the definition provided by H. T. Mark, Master of Method at Manchester University, was perhaps the most prevalent. For him, the 'New Education' signified:

> the deliverance of pupil and teacher from the excessive bondage to books, and to learning from books, which characterised the "old education".(96)

Magnus, when endorsing this line during the course of a discussion of manual training, gave to it a specifically Froebelian inflection when he claimed that manual training substituted for 'the old system of repression' the:

> Froebelian rule of utilizing all spontaneous activity, and of directing it on lines productive of serviceable aptitudes. (97)

But the kind of direction to which he referred was, for him, not to be coercive but to be in conformity with the learner's 'nature'.

Citing Emerson, the American transcendentalist, for support, Magnus also urged the adoption of learning by doing. The real education, he declared, was with those 'who produce it not with those who obtain it second-hand from teachers or from books'.(98) This belief also underlay, Armstrong's 'heuristic' system of science teaching. Writing for the Education Department's series of Special Reports, Armstrong defined heuristic methods as those which:

> involve our placing students as far as possible in the attitude of the discoverer - methods which involve their *finding out*, instead of being merely told about things.(99)

These notions, as has been shown, had no single source nevertheless they were consistent with those of the Froebelians. In addition, the modernizers, invoked the name of Froebel on so many occasions that it is permissible to suggest that the Froebelian discourse was particularly suited to the expression of their interests. Mather, for example, declared that the schools could only be improved by the infusion of the education system with the principles of Froebel, 'rightly understood'.(100) What constituted the 'right' understanding was, inevitably, a matter of much debate within the Froebel movement but for the modernizers it was one which was coloured by their overall strategy. Consequently, their use of Froebelian discourse only served to reinforce the hand and eye interpretation and the faction which promoted it.

5.0 Modernization: The School Boards' Response.

Thus far the discussion has centred on ideas and the uses made of them in debates rather than upon practices. The first attempts to make the

elementary school curriculum more practical, by the introduction of manual training, took place in London and the fate of those attempts provides a means of assessing the impact of the modernizers' project and that of the Froebel movement which was closely linked to it.

In 1885, the London School Board began an experiment in the instruction of boys in Standard 7 in the use of carpenters tools. The school at which the classes were run was the Beethoven Street School at Kensington.(101) Some notion of the extent to which this activity was felt to be marginal to the main work of the school is conveyed by the fact that the classes were run outside school hours by the school keeper who formerly had been a carpenter. Such inauspicious beginnings appear to have been typical. In Bradford, for example, Rooper was given, to teach woodwork, a cellar under a school which at one end contained coal and at the other, a furnace.(102) Obstacles of another nature soon emerged in London. The initial scheme was deemed a success but before the planned opening of five other classes took place, the School Board was surcharged by the Official Auditor for the costs incurred in setting up the workshop and for the purchase of the tools. While the Board awaited the result of its appeal against surcharge, instruction was carried on at Beethoven Street under the guise of a specific subject which was permissible provided that it had the approval of an inspector.(103) While the plans of the Board were halted, another experiment was begun in the teaching of Sloyd to boys on a Saturday morning at Carlton Road School, Camden Town. The boys were taught by Miss Clarke, a member of the Froebel Society and head of the Infants at Medburn Street School at St Pancras. Miss Clarke, significantly, had attended the course in Sloyd at Nääs.(104)

These experiments were evidently makeshift and constrained by the structure of grants which were intended to keep the scope of elementary schooling very narrow. Nevertheless, the London School Board, formulated another, more ambitious plan. In May 1887, the Rev. C. D. Lawrence successfully proposed the following resolution at a meeting of the London School Board:

> That in the opinion of this Board, it is necessary to introduce into elementary schools some regular system of manual training.(105)

This resolution was referred back to a sub-committee which had just been established to revise the curriculum which had been drawn up by the Huxley Committee and accepted by the Board in 1871. This sub-committee was chaired by William Bousfield, a Moderate member for Chelsea and it was established, in the wake of the over-pressure controversy, to examine and review the 'Subjects and Modes of Instruction'.(106) The terms of reference of this sub-committee included the injunction to:

> report whether such changes can be made as shall secure that children leaving school shall be more fitted than they are now to perform the duties and work of life before them.(107)

The sub-committee, which reported in 1888, made twenty nine recommendations: the first sixteen of which were intended to make the curriculum of the elemetary schools less literary and more practical. Of these recommendations, the most pertinent from the Froebelian point of view were:

> 1. That the methods of Kindergarten teaching in Infants' schools be developed for senior scholars throughout the Standards in schools, so as to supply a graduated course of Manual Training in connection with Science teaching and Object lessons but not so much as to include teaching the practice of any trade or industry ...
>
> 6. That classes for instruction in Slöjd be established in three selected schools ...
>
> 17. That the board authorise the appointment of an Organiser of Teaching, whose duties shall be to assist and advise teachers in the instruction of manual work, and in an improved method of instruction by the development of Kindergarten training.(108)

The first recommendation, which in effect was calling for a systematic training for industry, was rejected by the full Board when Bousefield sought to have it adopted. Much of the opposition focussed on the use of the term, kindergarten, which, it was argued, was too restrictive.(109) Instead of adopting the first recommendation, the School Board resolved to conduct experiments in extending kindergarten methods into the senior departments of three schools and appoint an Organizer of Manual Training or Advanced Kindergarten.

The person appointed to this post was George Ricks. Formerly Ricks had been an inspector with the Board who had encouraged the spread of the kindergarten. His justification for the introduction of Manual Training was the familiar one of faculty training. Manual Training was defined by him as:

> a development of the manual and visual activities of the child, having for its purpose to quicken and develope the mentalpowers of observation, attention, and accuracy; to cultivate the moral faculties.(110)

In a stream of books on Manual Training, written either by himself or in conjunction with others, Ricks sought to provide exercises and activities which were designed to bridge the gap identified by the Cross Commission between the occupations of the kindergarten and the manual training given to older children.(111)

Alongside these developments, the City and Guilds Institute, whose Principal was Philip Magnus, formed a joint committee with the London School Board to organize workshop training in six London schools. This training commenced in 1888 and was soon followed by courses in the use of tools for teachers which were organized by the City and Guilds Institute. In 1891, teachers who were associated with the work of the City and Guilds Institute formed the National Association of Manual Training Teachers. This organization competed directly with the Sloyd Association and the organizations produced by its successive metamorphoses. The main difference between the two bodies, however, was not so much concerned with theory or practice but with the fact that Sloyd attracted women teachers and amateurs whereas the Manual Training Teachers tended to be male and professionally trained.(112)

The training provided by these associations was insufficient to meet the demand for teachers of Manual Training and generally, without the restructuring of the system of elementary schooling such schemes as that of the London School Board were bound to be restricted. This was the view

also of the organized London teachers of the MBTA. While they welcomed in principle the move away from a curriculum which they held was 'too literary', they protested that the innovations were being introduced into conditions which were 'rigid and unintelligent'.(113) The existing conditions also presented a major obstacle to attempts to improve the teaching of science.

5.1 Obstacles to Modernizing the Curriculum: The Case of Science Teaching.

The Bousefield Report bracketed together Manual Training and the teaching of Science. Most of the science teaching which entered the Nineteenth Century elementary school did so in the guise of Object Lessons. The principles of these lessons were derived from Pestalozzi's work (114) and they often took the arid form which Arnold described in his report for 1878:

> ... one sees a teacher holding up an apple to a gallery of little children and saying: "An apple has a stalk, peel, pulp, core, pips, and juice; it is odorous and opaque, and is used for making a pleasant drink called cider".(115)

As the Board of Education concluded in 1910, unless the teaching of object lessons were in very skilful hands, the 'children had little to do beyond *passively* receiving instruction.'(116)

In an attempt to improve on the object lesson, science in London during the 1880's, as in Liverpool and Birmingham, was taught by peripatetic demonstrators.(117) In London, this attempt to introduce science into the elementary schools was organized by Dr. J.H. Gladstone, who was to become the father in law of J. Ramsay MacDonald.(118) The Code required that

instruction in science should 'be given mainly by experiment and illustration' and yet one of Gladstone's demonstrators told the Cross Commission that he had, 'under instruction', 2,201 boys in 20 schools.(119) With those ratios, there was no possibility of meeting the Code's requirement. In addition, the way that science teaching was assessed further militated against teaching by experiment. In Standard 5, for example, pupils were asked questions in the annual examination such as, 'In what bodies may you say that molecular attraction is balanced by the repulsive force of heat'.(120) Given these constraints it is little wonder that, in 1887, Gladstone complained that:

> It would appear that the action of the Education Department tends positively to frustrate the efforts of those who desire to increase the efficiency of natural science in elementary schools.(121)

The situation with regard to the number of departments which taught science, however inadequately, was altered slightly in 1890 when the Code relaxed the rule which required English to be the first choice if the two class subjects which were allowed were taught. In 1890, English was taken as a class subject in 20,304 departments and Science in 32 but by 1895, 16,272 departments took English as a class subject and 1,396 took Science.(122)

The teaching of Science was regulated by the Science and Art Department which financed the higher grade elementary schools which were a feature of large urban school boards outside London. In Birmingham, for example, the Bridge Street Seventh Standard School provided older boys with a technical training while boys from the Waverley Road Technical and Commercial

School were said to go 'straight from this school to the drawing shops and factories'.(123) Nevertheless, Birmingham was an exception among the school boards and the numbers of higher grade or organized science schools, although a vital element in working class schooling, remained very small.(124)

6.0 Action By the Education Department.

As was noted in chapter 2, the Technical Instruction Act of 1889 did not apply to the elementary schools. However, following the NAPTSE led agitation, the recommendations of the Cross Commission and the actions of some of the leading school boards, the Education Department, through the Code of 1890, signalled a new direction with regard to the content of the elementary school curriculum. As the Board of Education was to describe it later, following that Code, 'there was a decline in the importance attached to the literary side of the curriculum'.(125)

Among the main changes, the grants for the elementary subjects - the Three R's - were abolished and new subjects with a practical character were permitted. Drawing was made compulsory for boys in the Upper Standards and optional in the Infants. Laundry was added to the list of specific subjects which were taken by girls whose curriculum had never lacked a strongly vocational element.(126) A number of subjects were allowed to be counted for attendance subject to an inspector's approval. These included Manual Instruction which by these means entered the elementary schools officially. Later revisions of the Code followed the same course of making the curriculum for older children more 'practical'. For girls, Dairy Work was introduced in 1893 and Housewifery became an attendance subject. Domestic Economy was allowed as a class subject and Hygiene became a

specific subject. For boys, Cottage Gardening, which T.G. Rooper had campaigned for, was recognized in 1895.(127)

Like the argument of the modernizers for the introduction of 'practical' subjects, the Education Department discounted any suggestion of the vocational and instead based its justification of the new subjects on educational grounds. Hence the Revised Instructions of 1897 claimed that Manual Instruction was 'not intended as an initiation into any special handicraft'; the object of Gardening was not that of 'putting boys as apprentices to the gardeners craft' and Housewifery was not 'for training children for domestic service'.(128) The transparency of the Department's case was nowhere better demonstrated than in relation to Housewifery for while Manual Instruction was to 'train the hand and eye' and Gardening was for a 'general purpose', the vocational implications of Housewifery were inescapable. It was intended, said the Department to fit girls 'for the various household duties that devolve more or less on all women'.(129)

6.1 The Modernized Curriculum In Practice.

While these additions to the curriculum of older pupils may justifiably be regarded as evidence of the success of the modernizers' efforts, it is necessary to look for evidence that these changes in the Code were implemented in schools. If the uptake in Manual Training is taken as the acid test of the modernizers' project, on the grounds that it was the subject which they pressed the most, then their project, as far as it related to school knowledge, must be judged to have failed. In 1891, Manual Training was taught in 0.7% of inspected elementary schools. By 1910, after official encouragement, the proportion of schools in which Manual Training was taught had risen to only 20%.(130) As might have

been expected, these schools were nearly all in large towns. Many explanations for what Magnus described as, this 'lamentably slow' progress, may be offered not the least of which was the incoherent state of the central apparatus which controlled schooling. While, on the one hand, Manual Training was encouraged by the Board of Education it, omitted to include handicraft in the schedule of instruction for teachers in training with the consequence that suitable teachers were in short supply.(131) Cottage Gardening fared even less well. In 1902, it was taught in 1.3% of schools and by 1909 the proportion had risen to only 6.3%.(132). In Wales, only 34 boys in 1898 received the Cottage Gardening grant.(133) In contrast, the situation with regard to the girls' curriculum was much different. By 1895, for example Cookery was taught in 14% of all inspected elementary schools.(134) Out of the subjects introduced in the 1890's which had any utilitarian function, only Drawing, which following a recommendation of the Cross Commission, was made compulsory, spread at anything like the rate of Cookery.(135) Significantly, no extra training of teachers was required for Drawing and of the new subjects it required the least capital expenditure.

As was seen with regard to Science, it is unwise to infer anything about the quality of the teaching of these vocational subjects from the quantitative evidence. In his Report for 1895, Chief Inspector King, whose district included parts of the West Country and the Border Counties, revealed that in his district the only attempt to introduce the new subjects had been an experiment to introduce agriculture in a small country school. 'It was taught', he wrote, 'by a young woman who knew as

much of the subject as she could gather from the perusal of a primer'.(136) The result, King added, was 'hardly encouraging'.(137)

The verdict on the attempt to modernize the curriculum of older pupils in elementary schools during the 1890's must be that it succeeded only in particular areas. The majority of schools were barely touched by it. The apparatus of administration and control was, as Sidney Webb and others realised, incapable of securing the conditions which the modernization of the curriculum for working class pupils required. Most teachers were unprepared or unwilling to support the new initiatives and pupils, with an eye to a clerical future, preferred English to Science and had other ideas about what knowledge had the most utility. In addition, an older view of schooling proved remarkably tenacious and it was one which was entrenched deep in the heart of the educational apparatus of the state. Fitch, whose importance has earlier been noted, wrote in 1893 of the ascendancy of technical instruction and 'the study of physical laws (naturkunde)' (138) but, he argued, such a 'phase of opinion' represented 'an inadequate conception of the nature of true learning and its relation to human progress'. (139) The Rev. Sharpe, in whose Metropolitan district many of the innovations had first arisen, agreed. In his Report for 1895 he wrote:

> The acquisition of useful knowledge is one of the purposes of an English school, but a far higher purpose is often served by those educative processes which, though they may possess very little utilitarian result as regards success in a trade or profeession, will secure such training of mind and body as will render a boy or girl fitted for the battle of life.(140)

As will be seen this was also the view of those who around 1900 led a new wave of modernization aimed at the organization of the system of schooling and whose first moves were directed at the ascendancy described by Fitch. The attempted modernization of the curriculum for older pupils did not only run aground on the obstacles described above it was in a very real sense wrecked by a counter strategy which, among other things, destroyed the higher grade schools the core of the 'practical' curriculum.(141)

7.0 Modernizing Infant Schooling: The Official Encouragement of the Kindergarten

The situation regarding the schooling of younger children was different to that pertaining to that of older children in a number of respects; although, ultimately, attempts by the Education Department to modernize the schooling of young children encountered similar obstacles and they may be thought of as part of a general strategy of modernizing state regulated schooling. Significantly, the stance adopted by the Education Department towards the implementation of kindergarten practices in the elemetary schools changed considerably during the 1890's. In the absence of any other comprehensive theory and practice of infant schooling and in response to the occupation by the Froebelians of some of the spaces available in the area of infant schooling, the Education Department was compelled to look once more at the kindergarten. Changes which generated conditions more propitious to the spread of Froebelian ideas and practices also impelled the Education Department to conduct a re-evaluation of the kindergarten. These included the introduction of free elementary schooling in 1891 and the virtual abandonment of payment by results in 1895. In addition, some of the recommendations of the Cross Commission which were

supportive of the Froebelian approach were implemented and a climate favourable to the modernization of infant schooling was established during Acland's period as Vice-president.

7.1 Free Schooling.

The introduction of a degree of free elementary schooling is an instance of the power of the religious question to determine the course of the politics of education in the Nineteenth Century. Briefly, the Education Act of 1891 which provided for the payment of a 'fee grant' by the Education Department to schools which accepted pupils without charging fees was passed by a Tory government. Traditionally the party most opposed to free schooling, it did this in order to protect the position of the denominational schools.(142) Following the passage of the Act, the number of pupils on the registers began to rise as did the average attendance. Initially, the rise in attendance was most marked in the case of infants (143) The general rise in attendance was attributed by the Department to the effects of the Act and to a growing recognition among parents of the 'importance of education', though it did refer also to the continuation of 'the unfortunate stagnation of trade'. Experience had shown, claimed the Department, that 'dull trade makes a full school and brisk trade an empty one' as parents' attitude to school attendance was governed by the availability of employment for their children.(144) In the case of infants, however, such considerations were not applicable and it may be concluded that the increase in attendance of this category must have been due mainly to the availability of free schooling.

7.2 Circular 322.

This sharp rise in attendance in infant schools and departments forms the context in which the Education Department in 1893 issued Circular 322 entitled 'Instruction of Infants'.(145) This Circular dilated upon the section in the Revised Instructions to Inspectors which referred to infants. By 1893 this section had become a repository of official thinking on the schooling of infants as it now also contained extracts from Circulars 212 and 228 which were discussed in the last chapter. This way of operating, which constructed policy not by periodic revision but by a process of accumulation or accretion, ensured that the kindergarten was viewed almost exclusively in terms of 'hand and eye' training although its capacity to provide 'relief' from the strain of 'ordinary lessons' was noted.(146) Moreover, in the Revised Instructions the potential of the kindergarten to provide the basis for a continuous schooling in manual skills was identified. Thus, as well as being diverting and a means of increasing 'brightness and intelligence', activities such as 'elementary drawing, dialogues, picture and object lessons, the cutting out and inventing of paper patterns, modelling, weighing and measuring, and musical drill' were held to serve as:

a valuable link connecting the work of the infant school with some of the forms of technical or manual training, which are now [...] adopted in the upper classes of many good schools.(147)

Compared with this statement of the role and place of the kindergarten within the elementary school system, the sentiments expressed in Circular 322 regarding the methods of the kindergarten have the appearance of

emanating from an entirely different source. In Circular 322 it was made clear that the Education Department was 'desirous of giving further encouragement to the employment of Kindergarten methods'.(148) The extent to which official discourse had swung round to a position of one of support for the Froebelian ideas and practices may be observed in the following account of, what were termed in the Circular, 'the leading principles' which, it held, should be regarded as, 'a sound basis for the education of early childhood'. These the Circular listed as:

> (1) The recognition of the child's spontaneous activity, and the stimulation of this activity in certain well-defined directions by the teachers.
>
> (2) The harmonious and complete development of the whole of the child's faculties. The teacher should pay especial regard to the love of movement, which alone can secure healthy physical conditions; to the observant use of the organs of sense, especially those of sight and touch; and to that eager desire of questioning which intelligent children exhibit. All these should be encouraged under due limitations, and should be developed simultaneously, so that each stage of development may be complete in itself.(149)

What is almost as striking here as the endorsement of the developmental approach is the complete absence of any reference to either 'hand and eye' training or to moral training. In this, it displays marked similarities to the view expressed before the Cross Commission by Mark Wilks and, to a lesser extent, that of the Cross Minority itself.

With regard to recommendations concerning a suitable curriculum for infants the Circular advised against any 'premature preparation' for the subjects taken at Standard 1. Thus it was laid down in the Circular that it was, 'unnecessary before the sixth year is passed to employ books for Reading [...] or perform any exercise in Writing [...] or to do any formal Arithmetic work on slates'.(150) This was a major concession to the orthodox Froebelian position and a break with that held by Fitch. Instead of the Three R's traditionally taught , the Circular continued, these 'elementary subjects' should be taught through suitable kindergarten occupations, a list of which was appended.

Finally, with regard to the organization of knowledge, the Circular endorsed the Froebelian practise of 'correlation' or as it put it, 'the association of one lesson with another through some one leading idea or ideas'.(151) This would, it was argued, relieve 'the teacher from that useless subdivision in the elementary subjects which has been hitherto employed' and, in conjunction with less formal and more varied methods, 'materially improve the work of the younger children in infant schools'. (152)

7.3 Other Circulars and Their Use of the Froebelian Ideology.

In terms of the endorsement of the kindergarten by the Education Department, Circular 322 may be regarded as either the high water mark of the Froebelian tide of influence or as an aberration from the Department's previous strategy of selective incorporation. The latter is the more sustainable in view of the next Circular which touched upon similar matters but reverted to the more typical, 'hand and eye' stance. This Circular was entitled the 'Instruction of Lower Standards in Schools for

Older Scholars'. The main message of Circular 332, as it was numbered and which was issued in 1894, was that the lower classes in the elementary schools were the weakest educationally.(153) They were, it was claimed, often taught by methods which were 'arbitrary and conventional' and not 'truly educational'. The remedy suggested was the continuation of the 'natural methods' of the infant schools. These were said to consist of object lessons and hand and eye occupations which fostered 'an intelligent habit of observation and simple reasoning'. The correlation of subjects was again recommended as was the employment of women teachers in these Standards who had experience of infant teaching but especially those who had been trained for kindergarten work.

The inspectors were instructed to be careful to explain to managers how very interesting, inexpensive and educational these methods were and, as a further inducement to their adoption, it was argued that unless lessons were made attractive:

> the most thoughtful arrangements of time-tables will fail to attract the children of those parents who set little value on the education of their children.(154)

As was noted in the previous chapter, the Majority on the Cross Commission recommended that Object Lessons be given to the lower standards. In 1895 the Code made compulsory the teaching to Standards 1, 2 and 3 of object lessons and varied occupations. In the same year the Education Department issued Circular 369 on this topic. In this, as in the previous Circulars, there is a close fit discernible between the justifications for practices which were advanced and the Froebelian doctrines. Learning by things or by direct observation, for example, was

strongly recommended on the grounds that it cultivated the habit of 'obtaining knowledge directly and at firsthand'.(155)

Finally Circular 374, the last of this series of Circulars which recommended alternatives to the 'literary'elementary school curriculum, appeared in 1896. (156) This Circular which, like all the others discussed here appeared over the signature of Kekewich, was issued after Acland had left office and after Sir John Gorst had become Vice-President. This Circular addressed the question of what should be provided to fill the gap between 'Kindergarten Occupations' and Manual Training. The specific detail of the answer provided in the Circular, 'Suitable Occupations' is of little interest apart from confirming once more the official view of the kindergarten as a means of 'hand and eye' training. The discussion of this Circular in the Report of the Committee of Council on Education for 1895 is, on the otherhand, more explicit about the strategy of the Education Department in relation to modernizing the elementary curriculum. Terms like 'mechanical instruction' were used to describe methods which were said to treat 'the scholar' as 'the passive recipient of information'.(157) This kind of language was more commonly used by critics of the Department than by the Education Department itself.(158) But quite clearly the Department regarded itself as leading a top-down transformation of the elementary school curriculum. The Report confessed as much when it stated that:

> We have [...] done what is in our power to encourage a more living form of education by means of teaching designed to cultivate the habit of observation and the further use of the various powers of expression.(159)

The aim of this education, according to the Report, was not to prepare the scholar to acquire 'practical dexterity in his occupation or trade' but to encourage the 'more harmonious development of the whole of the child's faculties'.(160) Nevertheless, the frequency with which this line was repeated in official discourse during the 1890's arouses the suspicion that it was 'practical dexterity' rather than anything else which was what the Department wished to see produced by the elementary schools.

8.0 Some Effects of the Education Department's Modernization.

As has been shown in the previous section, at the level of official discourse there is considerable evidence of a shift in favour of a more 'practical' elementary school curriculum during the 1890's. Included in this shift was a powerful statement of support for Froebelian practices and principles. However, as in the previous chapter it is necessary to try to assess the extent to which the intentions expressed in official discourse were matched by changes in practice. A valuable source of evidence of changes in school practices are the annual reports of HMI. In addition, these reports also provide evidence concerning the attitude of HMI to the new policies. As the inspectorate was also an important collective actor in the formation and implementation of policy, its attitude is of significance.

8.1 Circular 322.

The reports of 1893 contain a number of reactions to the Education Department's Froebelian essay on the 'Instruction of Infants' of which the following are a representative selection. From the Chief Inspector of the North Western Division, the Rev. F.F.Cornish, there came a critical response. While he saw a place in the education of infants for the 'aids of

the kindergarten' he was not convinced that it was possible to make infant schools 'perfectly Fröbelian'. In his view, the Froebelian slogan 'Let us live for our children' was 'a counsel of perfection and likely to remain so'.(161) As he saw it, there were two obstacles to the implementation of the Circular:

> in large infants' schools where adequate salaries attract head-teachers with the requisite intelligence, the classses are too large, and in small schools where such *petite culture* might seem to be possible, the teachers of infants have not the required intelligence.(162)

The lack of 'intelligent' teachers was also regarded by Cornish as an obstacle to the spread of kindergarten methods to the lower Standards of the elementary schools. Training, in his view, would be to no avail as intelligence, the key to the problem, was a scarce commodity which should not be diverted, 'from the teaching of our upper classes to that of our lower'.(163) Although slightly different to the point made by Sneyd-Kynnersley which was quoted in chapter 4, there are clear similarities. Cornish was, in effect, arguing that the Froebelian system was a form of pedagogy which could only be taught by intelligent teachers who were best employed teaching the upper classes. Thus it was a class specific pedagogy whic was inappropriate for the elementary schools.

Like Cornish, W. S. Coward, the Chief Inspector for the West Central Division, which was primarily a rural Division, noted the differential reception of the new methods in urban and rural schools. In the towns, where there were more infant schools, he wrote:

> The children are managed with tact and kindness; their lessons are well varied, occupations and object lessons alternating with the elementary subjects... (164)

Kindergarten occupations such as 'mat-weaving, straw-plaiting, paper-folding, embroidery, drawing, stick-laying, and building with cubes' were common as were games.(165) In rural areas, where infant classes were more common the situation was somewhat different. There, the 'limited' instruction ended, according to Coward, in the, 'imperfect acquirement of a little bad reading, ill-taught writing and rule-of-thumb arithmetic.' Such object lessons as were given usually included wildly inappropriate ones like, 'the camel, the elephant, the cow, and the alligator'.

One of the most enthusiastic responses by an inspector to Circular 322 was made by Edmond Holmes (1850-1936) who became, after his retirement from the post of Chief Inspector of Elementary Schools in 1911, an indefatigable campaigner for 'child-centred' education.(166) Holmes' district was largely rural and it included parts of Kent and Sussex. Undoubtedly this, in part, explains his enthusiam for the Circular; about which he wrote:

> It would I think, be well if a copy of Circular 322 were sent to every infant school in the kingdom. Too much time is, as a rule, given in infant schools to reading, writing and arithmetic, and I should like to see the afternoon hours entirely given up to such pursuits as singing, drill, games, kindergarten work, object lessons, needlework, drawing, &c.(167)

On this evidence alone, it may be seen that Holmes did not in 1911 undergo a Pauline conversion to a view of education largely in agreement with that of the Froebelians. By his support for the approach of Circular 322, Holmes showed that he was, while an inspector, already in favour of the new methods.

As might have been expected, the schools under the large, urban School Boards were the ones which most readily followed the line of the Circular. They had more resources, better qualified teachers and many of the members of these Boards supported Froebelian ideas and practices. In Birmingham, HMI Osmund Airy reported, that the School Board:

> desirous of carrying out to the full the spirit of the departmental circular regarding kindergarten work, have lately appointed an inspectress of infant schools who has given special attention to this subject, and her presence and advice are without doubt having a stimulating effect.(168)

However, in spite of this kind of support for the kindergarten, Airy warned against the fetishization of the gifts and occupations and, in an observation similar to that of the Froebelian, William Herford quoted in chapter 5, Airy spoke of 'the danger of sacrificing the spirit of the kindergarten to the letter'. He continued by adding that:

> The teaching of kindergarten work may be, and very often is, as unintelligent and mechanical, as great a weariness to the flesh and spirit as the teaching of anything else'.(169)

In this there is more than a hint that only exceptional or charismatic teachers could teach the kindergarten; in other hands, the danger of routinization was high. A similar point to that of Airy was also made by A. Rankine, Chief Inspector for the West Central Division in his Report for 1897.(170)

The qualities associated with the charismatic personality were quite readily, in this context, translated into class terms so that what were required, according to HMI, were exceptional or middle class teachers. Thus a common denominator in the responses of the inspectors cited, as in others in the Annual Report for 1893, was a tendency for these upper-class men to fix the blame for any failure to implement the Circular appropriately not on the material conditions existing in the schools nor on the relations of pedagogy inscribed within them but on the, mainly working class, women teachers and their perceived lack of desired qualities. The following assessment by HMI J.A. Willis, an inspector in the Metropolitan Division was more direct than most:

> I have brought Froebel's work under the notice of the teachers. I am not prepared to say that it has affected the curriculum of the school to any extent, the trained infant teachers were already doing as much in that direction as their means and their staff would permit, and it was obviously not desirable to force a system requiring such special training into schools where the teachers had not received any training but that of practical experience.(171)

From this evidence it does not appear that the Education Department's encouragement of kindergarten methods met with much success particularly in rural areas. Nevertheless, the reports frequently refer to improvements in infant pedagogy and infant schools are constantly favourably contrasted with the lower Standards of the elementary schools.(172) With the exception of Holmes, however, few HMI, whose views were recorded in the annual reports during the 1890's, could be said to have been supportive of kindergarten methods. For those HMI able to detach themselves sufficiently from the attitude of contempt which they held for most of the infant teachers more training was the most commonly advocated need. This is a theme which will be addressed in some detail in the following chapter.

8.2 Circular 332.

In his report for 1894, the Chief Inspector for the North Central Division, the Rev. C.H.Parez, welcomed the introduction of object and kindergarten lessons into the lower Standards but noted that his colleagues had expressed misgivings about the ability of teachers in small schools to find the time to implement a scheme of object lessons and superintend 'hand and eye' exercises.(173) Some of these same colleagues were clearly unimpressed by the attempted innovations. HMI Henderson, for example, argued that what mattered most was 'the personality of the teacher' besides which 'the methods of the scientists and the theories of the educationalists were but dust and shadow'.(174) Another HMI in this Division, J. Tillard, complained that too often the object lesson was used to, 'pack a number of definite facts into the children's memory' and that the 'kindergarten teaching (so called)' failed frequently to 'arouse any

interest'. A situation which he attributed to the lack of training given to the average country teacher.(175) The situation as described in the Report of the Welsh Division for the same year was similar. The object lessons given in the infant schools were criticised by several inspectors and it was noted that although the elementary subjects were often very successfully taught, they were not often taught by kindergarten methods as the Education Department advocated.(176)

8.3 Circular 369.

The Chief Inspector for the South Eastern Division, T. W. Danby, was effusive in his praise for the introduction of object lessons and suitable occupations into the curriculum for the lower Standards.(177) However, the only concrete instance he gave of this was of paper cutting, mounting, drawing and brush-work in a girls' school at Kingston.(178) The situation in Birmingham, as might have been expected in that stronghold of manufacturing, was rather different. There, the gap between the varied occupations of the infant schools and the schools such as Waverley Road in which advanced work was carried out, was bridged by a scheme of hand and eye training devised by Mr A. W. Bevis. The School Board had appointed Bevis to supervise hand and eye work in the lower Standards. In Bevis' scheme, reported HMI Airy, Standard 2, for example, were able to draw 'solid materials'. In this instance, 'bricks in true proportion to real English bricks' in both 'plan and elevation'.(179) In the Metropolitan District the occupations were less well organized. Under the Hornsey Board, boys were taught Sloyd but elsewhere, colour work and paper cutting were the most popular with teachers as they required little apparatus.(180) The material constraints which accompanied elementary

schooling continued to operate virtually unabated. Clay modelling, for example, was ruled out as an occupation because the classes were too large to supervise it adequately.(181)

The inspectors reported that work under the heading of varied occupations produced 'beneficent effects' such as 'more cheerfulness' owing to the children taking 'more interest in their work'.(182) Rather than extolling the virtues of hand and eye training, these inspectors took the line that Mark Wilks had presented to the Cross Commission; namely that the 'rough' pupils were easier to manage if they were doing something practical. The Education Department evidently shared this view for in the Report of the Committee of Council for 1897, manual activities were advocated for boys who were held to be 'dull at their books'.(183)

9.0 Conclusion.

This chapter has attempted to demonstrate that the drive to modernize the curriculum of the elementary schools in the 1890's was largely a failure. With that failure went the ascendancy of the hand and eye faction within the Froebel movement, despite the considerable backing that it had received in official discourse. This was not the end for handwork; for although the implementation of Froebelian practices was, as has been shown, highly uneven, even in Infant schools and departments, the curriculum offered to younger children was beginning to move away from its traditional attachment to the Three R's and it did so sufficiently to permit the construction of an official myth that the schooling of young children had been transformed during this period.(184) In addition, although within the Froebel movement handwork was justified less and less

on the grounds of faculty training it retained an important place fortified by other theories which are the subject of chapter 10.

As was argued in chapter 2, the modernizing project was frustrated by a combination of organizational factors and the administrative modernization associated with Webb and Morant which in itself was symptomatic of the emergence of a new balance of forces within the power bloc. However there are grounds for suspecting that had the condition been more propitious and the attempt to alter school practices more successful, the modernizers would still have failed in their objective of maintaining British industrial supremacy. Firstly, because as the causes of what loss of competetive advantage as had occurred by the end of the Nineteenth Century were not educational, then an educational solution was inappropriate. Secondly, there was never any evidence, aside that is from the rhetoric with which much of this chapter has been concerned, that training in manual dexterity would produce the desired results. As soon as empirical studies which demonstrated the untenable nature of the theories which accompanied manual training, particularly the notion of transfer, became available then it became clear that other ways had to be sought to produce the 'new man'. Nevertheless, the notion that new men and women could be produced by schooling alone persisted and was reproduced by those who benefitted most from the view that schooling could provide solutions to problems which other practices could not.

Returning to the Froebel movement itself; while it was unable to radically transform school practices, during the 1890's, it had transformed official discourse regarding the schooling of infants. This was, at the same time, an indication that the treatment of young children was growing in

importance from the point of view of the state and a recognition that the only comprehensive set of ideas and practices, available concerning the schooling of young children, was that provided by the Froebelians. This was reinforced by the fact that whatever the attitude of the state apparatus to the Froebelian pedagogy, it was being transmitted to teachers both within colleges which were beyond the regulation of the state and even within some of those that it did regulate. How the Froebelian pedagogy was carried into the training colleges for teachers of young children forms much of the substance of the next chapter.

Chapter 6

FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES.

1). Except in schools which received grants from the Science and Art Department which continued to be paid on the basis of the results of an annual inspection until 1897. The examination of drawing in public elementary schools reverted to the Education Department in 1898. See: Sutton, G. (1965) 'The "Art" of the Science and Art Department in English Elementary Schools'. Paedagogica Historica. Vol. 5, Part 2. pp. 455-475.

2). Board of Education. (1911) Report of the Board of Education for the Year 1910-11. London, HMSO. p. 20.

3). Kekewich, somewhat characteristically, promoted his own role in these events. See: Kekewich. op. cit. pp. 110 and 231. . Sutherland (1973) op. cit. regards Kekewich as a key figure in bringing about these changes: pp. 322, 332-333 as did Curtis op. cit. p. 285 and Smith, F. op. cit. pp. 331-332.

4). Journal of Education. Vol. X. Feb. 1888. p. 72. The writer concluded that: 'Perhaps the sharpest thing that has been said on manual training was this of Pestalozzi's: "The State does not provide for skill in anything except for manslaughter".'

5). See: Lawson, J. and Silver, H. (1973) A Social History of Education in England. London, Methuen. p. 241. and Simon. (1974) op. cit. pp. 132-134.

6). Rousseau. op. cit. pp. 49, 143 and 214. Green, J. A. (1912) (ed.) Pestalozzi's Educational Writings. London, Arnold. p. 258.

7). Heerwart, E. (1884) 'The Kindergarten in Relation to the Various Industrial Products' in The Health Exhibition Literature. Vol. XIII. William Clowes, London. pp. 96-105.

8). ibid. p. 97.

9). ibid. p. 105.

10). ibid. p. 104.

11). ibid. p. 100. The allusion was to Froebel (1885) pp. 30-31. To which she added the rather Orwellian slogan, 'the child's work is called play'. See also: Heerwart, E. (1900) 'The Interdependence of all Things and the Moral Thereof' in Froebel, F. (1900a) Mother's Songs, Games and Stories. (Translated by Lord, F. and Lord, E.) London, W. Rice. pp. 222-238.

12). Gould. op. cit. p. 114. The notion is discussed extensively in Gould, S. J. (1977) Ontogeny and Phylogeny. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press.

13). Spencer. op. cit. p. 70. Froebel (1885) op. cit. pp. 18, 40-41, 160 and 282-283.

14). Heerwart. (1884) op. cit. p. 98.

15). For an extended statement of the theory see: Holman, H. (1921) Hand and Eye Training. London, Sir Isaac Pitman. (1st ed. 1905) and in particular the first chapter which is entitled 'The Development of the Race through the Development of the Hand'. For a 'scientific' version see: Cockburn, J. [1915] 'The Scientific Bases of Practical Educational Handwork' in Holman, H. (ed.) Handwork For Infants' Schools. Vol. 1. pp. 15-24.

16). Journal of Education. Vol. XI. Feb. 1889. p. 92.

17). ibid.

18). Child Life, in its first incarnation, was published between January 1891 and December 1892.

19). In October 1892, Hand and Eye began publication and it appeared monthly until April 1902. Hand and Eye declared itself to be dedicated to the promotion of: 'Sloyd, kindergarten and all forms of manual training' and, until the revival of Child Life, was the channel through which the Froebel Society made its positions known. Child Life was restarted in 1897 as the organ of the Michaelis Guild and. in 1899 it became the journal of the Michaelis Guild and Froebel Society.

20). Holman. op. cit. pp. 62-63. Bowen. (1901) op. cit. p. 190.

21). Chapman, E. (1887) 'Slöjd' Journal of Education Vol. IX. Feb. pp. 71-74.

22). Both the knife and the spoon were described at some length in Rooper, T. G. [1896] School and Home Life. London, A. Brown and Sons. pp. 465-479.

23). Chapman. op. cit. p. 73.

24). Bigge, M. L. (1971) Learning Theory For Teachers. New York, Harper & Row. pp. 26-28.

25). Marvin. (ed.) op. cit. pp. 186-187.

26). Most notably by Herbert Spencer in Spencer op. cit.

27). Chapman. op. cit. p. 72.

28). ibid. p. 73.

29). ibid.

30). ibid. p. 72.

31). Castles and Wüstenburg. op. cit. pp. 32-37.

32). Chapman. op. cit. p. 72.

33). ibid. p. 73.

34). P.P. 1887. XXX. op. cit. Q. 48,725.

35). Journal of Education. Vol. IX. May. 1887. p. 224.

36). Ward, M. (1888) 'Slöjd at Nääs'. Journal of Education. Vol. X. Dec. pp. 562-563. As befitted a 'modern' practice, two Japanese students were also present.

37). Journal of Education. Vol. X. Feb. 1888. p. 73. It was reported that among the attenders were teachers who: 'mean to introduce Slöjd work into the schools'.

38). Journal of Education. Vol. X. June. 1888. Letter from the head, Miss S. M. Jebb.

39). Journal of Education. Vol. X. Sept. 1888. p. 432. For Brabazon, the originator of Empire Day who seems not to have played a central role in the promotion of Sloyd, see DNB. For an account of Brabazon's part in many social interventionist organizations see: Reeder, D. A. (1977) 'Predicaments of City Children: Late Victorian and Edwardian Perspectives on Education and Urban Society' in Reeder, D. A. (ed.) Urban Education in the Nineteenth Century. London, Taylor Francis. pp. 81-82. See also: Ward, W. (1896) 'A Short Account of the Early History of Sloyd in this Country'. Hand and Eye. Vol. IV. No. 40. pp. 178-181. With her sister, Frances Lord, Mrs Ward brought out a pamphlet published by Cassell, in 1888, outlining the method of Sloyd and the tools required.

40). Holmes, G. M. op. cit.

41). Journal of Education. Vol. X. Sept. 1888. p. 432.

42). Journal of Education. Vol. XIII. April. 1891. p. 192.

43). DNB. Her articles were: Hill, R. Davenport. (1884) 'Cookery Teaching Under the London School Board'. Macmillan's Magazine. Vol. 50. June. pp. 99-104. and Hill, R. Davenport. (1888) 'Technical Education in Board Schools'.

Contemporary Review. Vol. 53. May. pp. 672-685. In the latter article, she discussed Sloyd.

44). See: Sutherland (1973) op. cit. pp. 311-312. Marvin was an advocate of 'progress'; a theme he pursued in such works as: Marvin, F. S. (1918) The Century of Hope. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

45). Webb, B. (1915b) op. cit. p. 5.

46). Woodham-Smith. op. cit. p.74.

47). Journal of Education. Vol. XIII. Feb. p. 140. Webb, B. (1915b) op. cit. p. 5.

48). See Johnson, G. F. (1922) 'Handwork' in Adams, J. (ed) The New Teaching. London, Hodder and Stoughton. pp. 337-356. Ballard, P. B. (1921) 'Handwork as a Factor in Education' in Watson, F. (ed.) The Encyclopaedia and Dictionary of Education. Vol. 2. London, Sir Isaac Pitman. pp. 773-775. Bramwell op. cit. pp. 107-116.

49). For a description see: Ballard, P. B. (1929) 'The Infant School Its Aims and Ideals' in Ballard, P. B. (ed.) The Practical Infant Teacher. London, Sir Isaac Pitman. p. 7.

50). Gordon and White. op. cit. p. 179.

51). Rooper. op. cit. p. 343.

52). ibid. p. 445.

53). ibid. p. 474.

54). ibid. p. 463.

55). As outlined, for example, in his 'Useful Work Versus Useless Toil' in Briggs, A. (1962) (ed.) William Morris Selected Writings and Designs. Harmondsworth, Penguin. pp. 117-138. Morris also shared with the Froebelians the view that reading of books by young children would, in

his utopia, be discouraged. Morris, W. (1970) News From Nowhere. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. pp. 24-25

56). See Armytage (1968) op. cit. pp. 289-303. With regard to the education of the children of the members of the Guild of St George, a utopian community which he founded in 1871, Ruskin declared: 'I do not care that St George's children - as a rule - should learn to read or write'. Quoted in Scott, E. H. (1931) Ruskin's Guild of St George. London, Methuen. p. 4.

57). Holman. op. cit. p. 90.

58). ibid. p. 105.

59). ibid. p. 61.

60). Bowen, H. C. (1901) op. cit. pp. 187 and 193.

61). The description is that of Sir William Hart Dyke, Tory Vice-President of the Committee of Council 1887-92, quoted in Sutherland (1973) op. cit. p. 314.

62). ibid. p. 330 note 85. For Alice Acland see: Bellamy, J. M. and Saville, J. (1972) Dictionary of Labour Biography. Vol. 1. London, Macmillan. pp. 5-6.

63). PP. 1895. XXX. Sloyd and Kindergarten Occupations in the Elementary School. Report by J. Struthers.

64). ibid. p. 4.

65). ibid.

66). ibid. p. 6.

67). ibid. p. 7. The report cited was that on 'Subjects and Modes of Instruction' which was produced in 1887.

68). PP. 1895. XXX. op. cit. p. 7.

69). ibid.

70). ibid.

71). ibid.

72). ibid.

73). ibid. p. 8.

74). ibid. p. 9.

75). ibid.

76). ibid. p. 10. and in support of this position, he cited Froebel's contention that 'man only understands thoroughly that which he is able to produce'.

77). In Germany, in 1887, the Association for Manual Training for Boys, which was led by Dr Waldemar Goetze, founded The Manual Training Seminary at Leipzig which became the centre of the drive for more manual training in Germany. In the United States, 1887 was the year when manual training was first introduced into the public elementary schools. Richards, C. R. (1914) 'Manual Training' in Monroe, P. (ed.) A Cyclopedia of Education. Vol. 4. New York, Macmillan. pp. 124-127.

78). See note 71, chapter 2.

79). See: Cardwell op. cit. pp. 119-136.

80). Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science 1887. London, John Murray. p. 167.

81). ibid. p. 28.

82). Mather, W. (1887) 'Manual Training a Main Feature in National Education' Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science 1887. London, John Murray. pp. 843-844.

83). Armstrong, H. E. (1902) 'Section L. - Educational Science. Presidential Address' Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science 1902. London, John Murray. p. 838.

84). Magnus, P. (1922) 'The Aims of Technical Education' in Watson, F. (ed.) The Encyclopaedia and Dictionary of Education. Vol. 3. London, Sir Isaac Pitman. p. 1644. He was referring to the situation in the 1880's.

85). ibid.

86). ibid.

87). Richards. op. cit. p. 127.

88). Magnus, P. (1900) 'Sir Philip Magnus on Manual Training'. Journal of Education. Vol. XXII. May. p. 291. This was his Presidential Address to the Annual Conference of the National Association of Manual Training Teachers. April 19th. 1900. For the NAMTT and further support for Magnus' point see Webb, B. (1915b) op. cit. pp. 4-5. See also: Magnus, P. (1907) 'Section L. - Educational Science. Presidential Address' Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science 1907. London, John Murray. p. 701. and Kay, J. (1921) 'Handwork' in Watson, F. (ed.) The Encyclopaedia and Dictionary of Education. Vol. 2. London, Sir Isaac Pitman. pp. 770-773.

89). Bellamy, J. and Saville, J. (1974) Dictionary of Labour Biography. Vol. 2. London, Macmillan. pp. 62-68.

90). PP. 1895. XLVII. Royal Commission on Secondary Education. pp. 494-498.

91). Simon. (1965) op. cit. pp. 201-203.

92). This tendency was most notably articulated in Tawney, R. H. (1922) (ed.) Secondary Education for All: A Policy for Labour. London, Labour Party Publications Department.

93). Gramsci. op. cit. pp. 286 and 297. In his discussion of Americanism and Fordism, Gramsci argues that the rationalization of work and production which was introduced by Ford required the formation of a new type of man/worker.

94). Mather. op. cit. p. 843. Magnus, P. (1902) 'Manual Training the Basis of Modern Education'. Journal of Education. Vol. XXIV. May. pp. 321-323.

95). Holman. op. cit. p. 90.

96). Mark, T. (1904) The New Movement in Education. London, Charles and Dibble. pp. 9-10.

97). Magnus (1900) op. cit. p. 291. He repeated the point in Magnus (1902) op. cit. p. 323.

98). Magnus (1900) op. cit. p. 292.

99). Armstrong, H. E. (1898) 'The Heuristic Method of Teaching or The Art of Making Children Discover Things For Themselves'. Board of Education. Special Reports on Educational Subjects. Vol. 2. London, HMSO. p. 390. On heurism see Brock, W. H. (1973) (ed.) H. E. Armstrong and the Teaching of Science 1880-1930. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

100). Journal of Education. Vol. XVI. August. 1894. p. 434.

101). Gautrey. op. cit. p. 88. Philpott. op. cit. p. 58. Maclure (1970) op. cit. p. 48.

102). Holman. op. cit. p. 105.

103). Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science 1887. London, John Murray. p. 166. PP. 1887. XXIX. op. cit. Evidence of Rev. J. R. Diggle. Qs. 29,740-29,742.

104). Gautrey. op. cit. p. 89.

105). Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science 1887. London, John Murray. p. 167.

106). This was the Report referred to in note (67).

107). Gautrey. op. cit. p. 63. Maclure (1970) op. cit. p. 45.

108). ibid. p. 46-47.

109). Lilley unpub. M. A. pp. 295-6.

110). Barter, S. [1892] Manual Instruction: Woodwork (the English Sloyd). London, Whittaker. p. viii.

111). PP. 1888. XXXV. op. cit. pp. 151 and 153.

112). Webb, B. (1915b) op. cit. pp. 4-6.

113). Gautrey. op. cit. p. 85.

114). Among the texts where the theory underlying the use of objects is discussed is: Pestalozzi op. cit. pp. 77-90.

115). Marvin (ed.) op. cit. p. 189.

116). Report of the Board of Education 1910-11. London, HMSO. p. 28.

117). PP. 1888. XXXV. op. cit. p. 150.

118). Maclure (1970) op. cit. p. 48. A student of Liebig's at Giessen, Gladstone became Professor of Chemistry at the Royal Institution. A Liberal, he served for many years on the London School Board and became its vice-chair. Although an evolutionist Gladstone led prayer meetings at the British Association's annual gatherings. Macdonald, J. R. (1920) Margaret Ethel Macdonald. London, Swarthmore. pp. 9-11. His daughter Ethel attended Doreck College, Bayswater, a private school for ladies, which was founded by the first President of the Froebel Society.

119). PP. 1888. XXXV. op. cit. p. 151.

120). ibid.

121). Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science 1887. London, John Murray. p. 167.

122). Sadler and Edwards op.cit. p. 59.

123). 'Mr Du Port's General Report for 1895'. Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1895-6. pp. 82-83.

124). Abney op. cit. p. 871. estimated that there were, in 1900, only about 70 higher grade schools operating as organized science schools.

125). Report of the Board of Education 1910-11. London, HMSO. p. 18.

126). Under the New Code of 1871, Needlework and cutting out were to be taught to all girls. Under the New Code of 1881, girls who were presented in class subjects had to take domestic economy.

127). Sadler and Edwards op. cit. pp. 38-39.

128). Report of the Board of Education 1910-11. London, HMSO. p. 19.

129). ibid.

130). ibid. p. 38.

131). Ballard (1921) op. cit. p. 774.

132). Based upon figures given in: Report of the Board of Education 1910-11. London, HMSO. p. 30.

133). 'Mr Legard's General Report for 1898'. Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1898. p. 188.

134). Based on Sadler and Edwards op. cit. p. 68.

135). By 1895 92% of schools taught Drawing to boys. ibid. p. 70.

136). 'Mr King's General Report for 1895'. Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1895-96. p. 107.

137). ibid.

138). 'Mr Fitch's Report for 1893' (On Training Colleges for Schoolmistresses) Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1893-94. p. 162.

139). ibid. p. 163.

140). 'Mr Sharpe's General Report for 1895'. Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1895-96. p. 149.

141). The strategy was led, as is well known, by Morant. Eaglesham (1967) op. cit. pp. 32-35.

142). Sutherland (1973) op. cit. pp. 286-287.

143). Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1893-94. pp. vii-viii.

144). ibid.

145). Circular 322. 'Instruction of Infants'. Revised Instructions (1893). Appendix VII. pp. 51-53.

146). Revised Instructions (1893). p. 6.

147). ibid. p. 7.

148). Circular 322. op. cit. p. 51.

149). ibid. pp. 51-52.

150). ibid. p. 52.

151). ibid.

152). ibid.

153). Circular 332. 'Instruction of Lower Standards in Schools for Older Scholars'. Revised Instructions (1894). Appendix VII. pp. 56-57.

154). ibid. p. 57.

155). Circular 369. 'Object Teaching'. Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1895-96. p. 530.

156). Circular 374. 'Suitable Occupations'. Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1896-97. pp. 576-570.

157). Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1895-96. p.v.

158). This was the theme of Holmes' frontal assault on state education which was launched after his retirement from the post of Chief Inspector of Elementary Schools. See: Holmes, E. G. A. (1911) What Is And What Might Be. London, Constable.

159). Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1895-96. p. v.

160). ibid.

161). 'Mr Cornish's General Report for 1893'. Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1893-94. p. 16.

162). ibid.

163). ibid.

164). 'Mr Coward's General Report for 1893'. Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1893-94. p. 43.

165). ibid.

166). On Holmes, see his obituary in The Times. Oct. 24th 1936 and Gordon, P. (1983) 'The Writings of Edmond Holmes: A Reassessment and Bibliography'. History of Education. Vol. 12. No. 1. pp. 15-24. Inexplicably Gordon omits to include the many contributions made by Holmes to New Ideals Quarterly.

167). Holmes' Reports are quoted in 'Mr Danby's General Report for 1893'. Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1893-94. pp. 68-69.

168). Airy's Reports are quoted in 'Mr Du Port's General Report for 1893'. Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1893-94. p. 87.

169). ibid.

170). 'Mr Rankine's General Report for 1897'. Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1897-98. pp. 247-248. Rankine adopted the language

of horticulture in his observation that: 'Our child-gardens abound in lovely plants, and the air that breathes from them is a moral tonic'. But, he warned, 'The best of systems may degenerate into routine or crystallise into pedantry....'

171). Quoted in 'Mr Sharpe's General Report for 1893'. Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1893-94. p. 102.

172). For example: 'Mr Cornish's General Report for 1893'. op. cit. p. 17. and 'Mr Coward's General Report for 1893'. op. cit. p. 43.

173). 'Mr Parez's General Report for 1894'. Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1894-95. p. 36.

174). ibid. p. 67.

175). ibid.

176). 'Mr Williams' General Report for 1894'. Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1894-95. p. 107.

177). 'Mr Danby's General report for 1895'. Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1895-96. p. 46.

178). ibid. p. 47.

179). 'Mr Du Port's General Report for 1895'. op. cit. p. 83.

180). 'Mr Sharpe's General Report for 1895'. Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1895-96. p. 130.

181). ibid.

182). ibid. p. 129.

183). Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1897-98. p. xx. This line also appears in PRO ED 77/14 'A Report by one of HM Inspectors on Some Educational Experiments Carried out in Public Elementary Schools in Shoreditch and Stepney' [1912] and PRO ED 77/205 'Report on Schools

Attended by the Very Poor Children in London'. (E No 5 1913) One of a series of Inspectors' Reports on Elementary Subjects produced for the use of the Inspectorate and the Office (Private Office of the Board of Education) only.

184). See, for example, Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1894-95. p. xi which talks of the way that object lessons and suitable occupations had become an integral part of the infant school curriculum and that such practices were spreading to the upper classes of the elementary schools.